A PLAIN DISCOURSE,

Proving the

DIVINE AUTHORITY OF THE Holy Scriptures;

WHEREIN

The late *Bold Attempts* and *Aspersions* of the *Jesuits* and other *Missionaries* of the Church of *Rome* are Confuted;

And all their

OBJECTIONS

Against our

English Bible

Are *fully* and *clearly Answered.*

By a Reverend Prelate of the Church of *England.*

LONDON: Printed, and Sold by *Randall Taylor*, near *Stationers-Hall*, 1689.

BRITISH MUSEUM

To His GRACE

The DUKE of ORMOND.

May it please Your GRACE,

I Have presumed to Intitle Your Grace to this small Piece, not out of conceit of its Merits, but sense of mine own Obligations. People use to pay their debts as they are able; and when All they can do is in effect Nothing, to have publickly

acknowledged themſelves Inſolvent, is, to have aimed at being Juſt.

May then Your Grace pleaſe to Accept of my having intended well, both in the Book and Dedication: And to believe amongſt the Numerous Votaries to Your Illuſtrious Self and Family, he who brings only this mite of Gratitude, has as much Zeal to approve his full Duty, and as induſtriouſly watches opportunity to do ſo, as any man living.

My

My Lord,

I ſhall never fail daily, till Your Grace ſhall be above ſuch Services, to offer up to that God, whom You have imitated in *humbling Your ſelf* to *raiſe the poor out of the duſt*, my moſt cordial Supplications, for the encreaſe of Your Glories and Felicities. The Supreme Lord, the *Maſter of the whole Family in Heaven and in Earth*, will repay, what his poor Menials cannot, *all the Good* Your Grace

has

has done to his Houſe, and therein, to the unworthieſt of his Vaſſals,

YOUR GRACES

Ever Bounden Orator

and Servant,

E. Cork and *Roſſe.*

THE

PREFACE.

WHILE the late Attempts made on Scripture by two or three Persons, of some Learning, but too much Leisure, remained in the Language wherein they were written, I hoped, that for the main, they would only be read by men of Judgment, past the danger of a shock; or at worst by some young Students in the Universities, where the Profound Judgment and Vigilance of those, who preside, would soon stifle any mischief that could proceed from them. But when they began to fly about in English, and that

that even in these remoter parts, into the hands of all sorts, considering how greedily most Men catch at Novelties, what Patience the most curious and delicate Tempers have for Discourses which pretend to Relax the Obligations that some Priests say, lye on Mankind; and withal how great the Number of those, who are, or are ready to be, Tainted, every where is, I could no longer totally temperate either Tongue or Pen.

I thought no Wounds to Religion more dangerous, than those which fall on Scripture; for that these affect the very Vital Fountains of the common Christianity. Hence still my concernment grew on me, which I desire may be admitted in excuse for Exposing this Remedy, how weak soever. It is what for the present I had: I ought not to be want-

wanting to my Duty; and if what I thus have done ſhould prove effectual to the ſtaying up but one Tottering Perſon, I am aſſured, the Righteous Judge of all will one day acquit me from the Imputation of having been Impertinent, or over-buſie.

My extreme Brevity is from Deſign, not Sloth. I look upon the Cauſe I defend, as ſuch, which Pleads its ſelf when once heard, nor needs more words than juſt ſuffice to Open it. And beſides, I had a mind to Gratifie thoſe, who cannot obtain from themſelves Leiſure or Patience for peruſing Books on this Subject, were they of length proportionable to thoſe they anſwer.

The Time the Reader adventures on this Diſcourſe is very little, the Argument and Concern very great: and he may without Impoſition

ſition on himſelf, conclude, ſuch Perſon muſt write very ill indeed, who pretending to entertain men for an hour on this Theme, ſhould therein give them occaſion to repent of loſs of time.

Be pleaſed therefore to reſolve to go through the whole with a placid, free and unbyaſt Mind, and then judge as you liſt. God guide us all, above Error, and our preſent Crepuſcular Knowledge, into Light and Glories Eternal.

ER-

ERRATA.

PAge 42. *line* 18. *read* falſe.) In—. *Pag.* 52. *lin.* 21. *blot out*, ſo abſolutely. *pag.* 79. *lin.* 15. *and* 21. *for*, xxxviii, *read* xlviii. *pag.* 105. *l.* 6. *r.* פתק. *p.* 121. *l.* 20. *r.* רקרו. *p.* 122. *l.* 1. *r.* רקרו. *p. ibid. l.* 7. *for* Hezekias *r.* Heſychius. *p.* 129. *l.* 10. *r.* פתק.

BRITISH MUSEUM

SCRIPTURE AUTHENTICK, AND *FAITH CERTAIN.*

§. 1. THE moſt Sacred ſort of Oracle, among the *Jews*, was reputed a voice immediately from Heaven; and therewith was our Saviour own'd ſeveral times, and particularly at his Transfiguration on the Mount, *Matt.* xvii. 5. & 2 *Pet.* i. 17. Then and there, *he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came ſuch a voice to him from the excellent glory; This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleaſed.* With which miraculous atteſta-

tion the Apoſtle S. *Peter*, there comparing the proofs, that the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament, and eſpecially the Prophetical ones, gave, of his being the Son of God (the Meſſias, or Saviour of the World) affirms, in the 19*th* verſe, thoſe Scriptures to be the *ſurer* and ſtronger evidence of the two, and commends the believing *Jews* for *attending* to them, and admitting them as ſuch. And yet ſo bold a vein of Scepticiſm, ſhall I ſay, or Atheiſm, has poſſeſt ſome, who would appear to be of the moſt knowing, if not infallible part of the Chriſtian world, as that it has been publickly contended; and now of late with freſh earneſtneſs, and new-ſtarted Pleas ſome endeavour to juſtifie, that there is no certainty at all in Scripture, eſpecially in that of the

the Old Teſtament: and all perſons are reproached as fools, illiterate and of ſhort judgment, who pin their Faith on Holy Writ. For neither Original, ſay ſome, nor any Verſion whether old or new, cry others, are to be depended upon. The Language in which the Scriptures were written is loſt, the Copies corrupt, the Verſions imperfect, and the neweſt, which ſome believe to be the exacteſt, are really, ſay they, the worſt; ſo that nothing of them muſt be relied upon: but Tradition (that is, what a Party of cunning men have agreed to tell us) is the only ſure foundation of Faith. On occaſion of theſe importunate inſtances, I crave leave to ſay, after the Apoſtle, and ſpeak a few words for the Old *ſure word of Prophecy*, and I hope I ſhall make

it out, that *they do well who take heed thereto.*

§. II. To which purpoſe I ſhall endeavour, 1. *Poſitively* to *eſtabliſh the certainty of the Scripture*; and chiefly of the *Old Teſtament*, or the demonſtrative Evidence it bears. 2. To *anſwer* the new-deviſed, or *freſh-ſtarted Objections*, againſt its certainty. 3. To lay down ſuch *Rules*, by which we may *from Scripture be certain of our Faith.* And if the concluſion be by urging or *adviſing* ſuch *practice* as may moſt naturally comport with the deſign of the Diſcourſe, it may be hoped the pious Readers patience will not be tired in that laſt ſo ſhort Stage.

§. III. And Firſt, That the *word of Prophecy is ſure*, or the *Scriptures* of

of the *Old Teſtament* a more demonſtrative evidence that Chriſt was the *Meſſias*, than was that miraculous voice from Heaven.

For a foundation we will take it for granted (what cannot be denyed) that no man of common reaſon who reads the Old Teſtament, can queſtion, but that theſe things were explicitly, and as good as in terms, foretold; that the *Meſſias* ſhould be *born of a Virgin*; that the *place* of his birth ſhould be *Bethlehem*; the *time*, while the *ſecond Temple* was ſtanding; that he ſhould live a moſt *holy, modeſt, and humble*, but yet a mean and *deſpiſed*, life; that he ſhould make *his ſoul an offering for ſin*; and be *cut off, but not for himſelf*; that he ſhould *riſe* again before his *body could ſee corruption*; that he ſhould *aſcend into heaven*,

and give gifts to men, (impower ſundry ſorts of people to ſupernatural acts, by a miraculous effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt;) that ſome time after this, the *City of Jeruſalem* and the *Sanctuary* ſhould be *deſtroyed*, and *deſolations were determined upon them*; the nation of the *Jews* ſhould be diſperſt, and live as vagabonds, and accurſed upon the face of the earth. The Original, and generally all Tranſlations agree in theſe, and ſuch like material Prophecies of the *Meſſias*, as theſe; nor can it be pretended there are ſuch ambiguities of Words, varieties of Senſes and Verſions, or diſcrepancies of Copies, that all theſe, and many other like points predicted of the *Meſſias*, are uncertain. Now this being admitted, I ſay, that theſe things being thus foretold of Je-

ſus

ſus Chriſt, ſo many hundred years before his Nativity; and being alſo exactly verified of him in the fulneſs of time, the Records which predict them are a greater and ſurer proof of his being the Son of God, and Saviour of the world, than the miraculous voice from heaven. For,

§. IV. 1. This *Prediction* was no *leſs a miracle* than that immediate voice. By a Miracle we mean, a *ſenſible effect ſurpaſſing the power of nature*: Now what power (eſpecially at ſuch a vaſt diſtance of time) could foretel theſe particularities, but his, by whoſe counſel they were effected? that is, they were Divine, that is, Supernatural and Miraculous. Beſides,

2. Theſe Predictions are a more *publick* and *laſting* Miracle. That

voice was only heard by a few (*Peter*, *James*, and *John*,) attested but by three or four witnesses, and transient: This, known to thousands, to myriads, an evident miracle, in actual being to this day, and likely to continue such as long as men shall live on the face of the earth; or, indeed, to survive the world.

3. In these Predictions there is *no possibility of our being*, or of mens pleading that we can be, *imposed upon*. Collusion, Fiction or Mistake, might be at least pleaded in case of the immediate voice: In one instance of it (*John* xii. 29.) the people that heard it, said, it thundered, others that an Angel spake to him: but neither could thunder promulge, nor Angel, either foretel or verifie these things (1 *Pet.* i. 12.) *Angels desired*

to look into theſe things, but knew them not, till revealed.

In ſumm then, theſe predictions being no leſs a Miracle than that immediate voice upon the Mount, and as a *Miracle* having theſe three advantages of the other, that they are a *more publick*, *more laſting*, and *more unexceptionable* miracle than that, we may ſay with the Apoſtle, in having the Scriptures of the *Old Teſtament*, we have a *more ſure word of Prophecy*, than was the Voice from heaven.

§. V. And having thus proved the certainty of the Old Teſtament, by way of *Corollary* we may infer the truth of the New. For this containing partly the *Hiſtory* of the things *predicted*; partly a Scheme of *Doctrine aſſerted*, *in the*

the Old; by reaſon of its *accord* with the Old, muſt be *true*, if that be true. At leaſt nothing can be juſtly pretended againſt its truth, except the *matter of Fact* ſhould be deny'd, *viz.* that ſuch a perſon lived as Jeſus of *Nazareth*; and that he did ſuch things, and had ſuch things done unto him, as are there recorded. Now as to this, beſides the undeniable credit of Hiſtories, there are in being a people diſperſt over all the world, who profeſs ſuch a perſon to have been of their Nation, and that they executed him, and profecuted his followers, and ſtill exetrate both; as indeed we read in thoſe books. Now this matter of fact being admitted, it is ſure no power could effect ſuch things for fulfilling of thoſe Prophecies, but that Divine power

power from whence the Prophecies firſt came. To predict things hundreds of years before they come to paſs, and in purſuance of thoſe Predictions, at ſuch diſtance to effect them, are both of the ſame omnipotence: Therefore the *Relations* contained in the New Teſtament are true: therefore the *hiſtorical Records* of them muſt be *true*, becauſe containing a relation of things truly done, and by the finger of God. And the *Doctrinal* part muſt be *true*, becauſe according with, and aſſerted by the Old Teſtament, which was before proved true. Therefore ſeeing both Hiſtorical and Doctrinal parts are true, the *whole New Teſtament is a ſure word.* We have then (God be bleſſed) both *a ſure word of Prophecy*, and *a ſure word of Goſpel too*, and *they do*

do well who take heed thereto.

§. VI. But I conceive I may upon the Apoſtles authority affirm, they do not ſo, who imploy their wits and learning to traduce and overthrow the certainty of this ſure word of Prophecy. For if the ſurer be uncertain, what will become of the other? Nay, what of all evidences of Chriſtianity? May I therefore take leave to *anſwer* the new-form'd (at leaſt *new-trim'd*) *Objections* againſt the *certainty of the Old Teſtament*: which it is (therefore) now more neceſſary to do, becauſe the books that proclaim thoſe Objections to the world are made Engliſh, and in the hands of the very common people. The ſumm of thoſe Objections I may reduce to three heads; the Imputations of *Corruption*;

ruption; of *different Readings*; and of the *none* or *indeterminate Senſe* of the Originals.

Objection I. We have not the books of the Old Teſtament as they were written by the firſt Authors, but certain pieces, and *contractions* of them, and thoſe too very *mutilate and corrupt.* §. VII.

Anſw. I crave leave to make anſwer for the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament out of thoſe of the New. The Apoſtles pronounced the Scripture as extant in their days, *A ſurer word of Prophecy* (as we have ſeen) *given by inſpiration of God, able to make men wiſe unto Salvation, perfect, throughly furniſhed to all good works,* (2 *Tim.* iii. 15, 16, 17.) Now we ſay, They are *the ſame at preſent* as to all ſubſtantial points (variations of Spelling

ling and Orthography we are not to account for) as they were then. They then consisted of the *Law*, *Prophets*, and *Psalms* or Poetical books (at least) the third part was the כתובים, or HAGIOGRAPHA, wherein the Psalms are (*Luke* xxiv. 44.) They consist of the same still; and, as far as can appear, in the self-same order. *Act.* xiii. 33. *It is written in the second Psalm, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.* These words are in our second Psalm to this day. And again he saith in another Psalm, *thou shalt not suffer thine Holy one to see corruption, v.*35. these words are in that other Psalm (*viz.*) *Psal.* xvi. 10. And again, *David* himself saith in the book of *Psalms*, *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy foot-*

stool,

ſtool, Luk. xx. 42. That paſſage is alſo in our Pſalms, and in a Pſalm inſcribed to *David*, as the Author, *viz.* in *Pſal.* cx. Not to inſtance in more paſſages, as might be done abundantly.

Beſides, it is not credible (as S. *Hierom* in his time, out of *Origen* anſwered thoſe who objected the falſification of the Old Teſtament) it is not credible, I ſay, that our Lord, and his Apoſtles, who ſo ſharply reproved the other crimes and vices of the *Scribes*, and the ſeveral Sects of the *Jews*, ſhould have been ſilent of this, which was the greateſt of all (*being falſe in the greateſt* DEPOSITUM) taking from, or corrupting the Divine Oracles committed to their charge. And this Argument though from Negative Au- §. VIII.

Authority, is the more conſiderable upon the ſcore of S. *Auſtin's* Doctrine, who gives it as a general Rule, that *where there is a fit place in Scripture to ſay a thing, if it were ſo, and it is not ſaid, the argument is good though from Negative Authority, that it is not ſo.* Now what more fit places can be imagined, than where our Lord appeals to the Scriptures touching his Miſſion and Doctrine; when he commands his hearers *to ſearch* the *Scriptures*; when he tells his Diſciples and the multitude, *The Scribes and Phariſees ſit in Moſes's ſeat*, and requires them to *obſerve and do* what they bid them, but *not to do after their works; for they ſay and do not.* In all appearance what they ſaid as from *Moſes*, or ſitting in his ſeat (*the Scripture as reported or delivered by them*) was genuin

ruin and ſincere enough, however vitious their practices were. Who here can imagin, that, had the *Scribes* then (and *Scribes* muſt do it, or none could) had they, I ſay, then falſified, corrupted or curtail'd the Scriptures, we ſhould not in ſome of theſe and like places have heard of it? Would not ſome Caution or other have been annext, to this purpoſe; *Search, but take heed of corruptions* in ſuch a place: Know there are defalcations in ſuch. In a word, and to ſpeak out, Our Lord had not been faithful in the houſe of God, had he not warned the family, of ſuch an evil. I know a certain Perſon has pretended to reply to this anſwer, but his reply is empty and frivolous.

§. IX. Laſtly, as to this Objection; I ſay, 'tis morally impoſſible ſince our Saviours time, and indeed for many hundred years before that, that the Scriptures ſhould have been corrupted: for the multitude of Copies was then ſuch, has been ſince much more ſuch, and ſo far diſperſed, that neither one man, nor one body of men, could ever get them into their hands to corrupt them; and if ſome few, or many Copies, had been corrupted, but not all, the ſincere number would have detected the corrupt. To give a parallel inſtance, which will eaſily be underſtood by all, who can read *Engliſh*. Our *Engliſh* Bibles, in ſundry impreſſions of this age, are corrupted in *Act.* vi. 3. *Chuſe ſeven men, whom ye may appoint,*

YE

YE falſly for WE [ὑς κατας ήσωμεν,] The corruption may be found in the later *Edinburgh*, *Cambridge*, and ſince very ordinarily in divers (indeed moſt) *London Editions*. Now this being done, not till the Faction had crumbled it ſelf into ſeveral minute parties, all pretending Scripture for their ſeveral diſtinctive little opinions, 'tis not improbable it might be done at firſt with deſign, and particularly of thoſe, who would eſtabliſh the peoples power, not only in Electing, but even in Ordaining, their own Miniſters. Mean while let it be done by whom it might, Take an *Edinburgh Edition* of 1636. a *Cambridge* one of 16 . a *London* one of 1642. being it was not poſſible for the Faction to get all theſe Copies and a multitude more in, as being ſo vaſtly nume-

rous; the true old Copies examined and compared, diſcover the Variation from them, that is, the Corruption; and a more Authentick one than any of them, that is, the Original Greek, if any doubt remain, decides the whole Controverſie. In like manner, there were amongſt the *Jews*, even in our Saviour's days, and much more ſince, a vaſt number of Copies of the Old Teſtament (for they read in their Synagogues every Sabbath day both Law and Prophets (*Act.* xiii. 27, & xv. 21.) wherefore beſides what they had for private uſe, they muſt at leaſt have as many publick Books as Synagogues, and Synagogues they had divers in every City. ('Tis incredible, almoſt, what their Authors report of the number of Synagogues in *Jeruſalem* it ſelf) And there

there were amongſt them ſeveral Sects too, and Scribes of every Sect, all ſufficiently watching over one another, had there been any falſe dealing of this kind. Nay, the very Ten Tribes upon their Seceſſion, and, in probability, much more after their diſperſion, had Copies of the Law, to which we owe the preſent Samaritan-Hebrew Text. But it is certain the *Jews* and *Samaritans* were mortal enemies; would not eat, converſe, diſcourſe together. Now that all their ſeveral Sects and Synagogues, that theſe two laſt named adverſe and mutually incenſed Nations, ſhould conſpire to bring all their Copies together, to vary or corrupt them all alike, and the world never hear of this combination, and the reconcilement of the Parties in order thereunto, is

not morally possible. But if all were not brought together and altered alike, as before said, one must convince another of falshood. And there being, as shall be presently made out, no Variations of any considerable moment betwixt the Copies of the Old Testament, which we now have in common use, and the most antient or sincere ones, that can be produced, (at least none having made it appear there is any such Variation) but in the stead thereof a marvelous agreement, there can be no such corruption, as the Objection pretends. And this brings us to the

§. X. *Second Objection.* There are in the *Hebrew* Originals actually produced, say some, *different Readings*, and both cannot be true, (for truth

truth is but one) therefore the one of them muſt be corrupt.

Anſw. There are indeed *different Readings*, and ſome too, as pretended, from famed *different Traditions*. *Rabbi Aſcher* ſetting up one way, and *R. Naphthali* another: and from them the *Oriental Jews* obſerving one Lection, the *Occidental* another. And all theſe are collected by diverſe, and particularly are now extant in the *Appendix* to the *Engliſh Polyglott*. But yet all theſe Diverſities make only a great noiſe, are indeed of no conſiderable importance. For the inſtances of Diverſity are ſuch as no one, but a ſuperſtitious *Jew*, or ſome perſon who had a mind to unſettle foundations, and for want of Arguments were concern'd to catch at any ſhadows of Probability, would contend about

them. They are ſuch mighty matters as theſe; Whether the ſame word ſhould be written with a long *E* or a ſhort *A*; whether another ſhould be written with their longeſt *O*, or with one ſomewhat ſhorter; whether it ſhould have an Accent of this kind, or of that; whether a ſupernumerary (which they call a Quieſcent) letter ſhould be written, or whether, being it might without dammage be ſpared, it ſhould be omitted.

Not much unlike hereto is alſo the noiſe made with what they call the *Keri* and the *Ketib*, that is, the *Marginal* and the *Textual Reading*: as if there were ſome great repugnancy betwixt theſe: Whereas, in brief, the *thing*, or *matter*, is ſtill the *ſame* in both, the *manner of expreſſion* a little *different*. And this occaſioned partly

ly by the Superſtitious modeſty of ſome Rabbies, putting into the Margin certain words, which they thought more honourable to be read, inſtead of ſome other broader term in the Text [as, 2 *Kings* xviii. 27. they would not read it *Piſſe*, but the *water of their feet*, forſooth] partly by reaſon of ſome letters, or words, dubiouſly written in ſome venerable antient Copies, and ſo variouſly read. From which Antient Copies, out of reverence, they would vary nothing in tranſcribing, but copying the text exactly and entirely as they found it, that which was by the moſt learned, in ages of old, judged the more correct reading, they put in the Margin, and called it *Keri*. So that the ſumm of the difference is, 'tis one way in ſome Copies, 'tis otherwiſe in others; and which

which way ſoever we take, the matter is of no great moment; we have liberty without danger to take either reading, which pleaſeth us beſt. Now, under favour, ſuch *various readings* as theſe, are not Arguments of the Scriptures corruption, but of *Gods Providence and Humane induſtry* to *preſerve Scripture from corruption.* And in concluſion of this point, I may boldly aver, there is not one *Article either of Faith*, or *Chriſtian practice, concern'd* in all the *various Hebrew Lections* in the World. The knowledge of them, to uſe the Rabbinical phraſe, is only an *Hedge about the Law*: and our care to read aright, in matters of the ſmalleſt concern, keeps us from reading amiſs in the greater.

The

The *Third Objection* is, The *Original is insignificant*: For, beſides that *None*, no not the very *Jews* themſelves, *can read it*; the *words* of that Language are *Equivocal*, and ſo the *Tranſlations all vain*, and not to be credited; as being taken from an Original, which is in a manner whatſoever people will make it, and much different from what it was, as uſed by our Lord and his Apoſtles, while on earth. §. XI.

To be as brief and diſtinct as may be in Anſwer to this Objection, as to its ſeveral parts:

Firſt, It is a pleaſant thing, to perſwade men they cannot read, when actually they do read, and themſelves know, and others hear them ſo to do: Or, that now of old that way of Reading has been §. XII.

loſt,

loſt, which yet has been tranſmitted as all Ordinary Arts are (but with infinitely more care) from hand to hand, by people who have in their Generation made it their whole buſineſs (as to this day many *Jews* do) meerly to read and write their Law. It is ſure, and ſome of the fierceſt of our Contradictors confeſs, the *true way of reading* was *known* in *Origen*'s time: for he tranſcribed the Hebrew text, both in Hebrew Characters, and expreſt again, as well as it could be, in Greek letters into his *Hexapla*. It was known in *Hierom*'s time: For he had that *Hexapla*, and amended his Copy of it by the more Authentick one in the Library of *Cæſarea*; and out of the Hebrew text, by help of that Copy, made his Tranſlation. Thus, for at leaſt

400

400 years after Chriſt, we are, as I think it muſt be acknowledged, ſecure. About the year 1000 at furtheſt, if not ſooner, all men confeſs the Tradition of the preſent reading to have been in uſe, and ſithence, at leaſt, to have been currant in the world, by the induſtry of the *Maſorites* of *Tiberias*. In the interval then of 600 years, this the old Art of Reading muſt be loſt, and a new one invented, by that people whoſe Original native Language this Hebrew was. Which negligence firſt, and afterwards moſt laborious Artifice of the *Jews*, how improbable it is, eſpecially ſeeing we have left to us the ſeveral Prophecies, at leaſt ſo many ſeveral Prophecies of the *Meſſias*, and of the *Jews* dealing with him, ſo intire in the text, even againſt the ſuppoſed inventors

tors themſelves; is ſo notorious that I need not ſpeak. Beſides, what cauſe, or even appearance and likelihood of any cauſe, can in any Hiſtory be ſhewn, why in that Period of time, rather than any other, the *Jews* ſhould loſe the Reading of their Language? Indeed conſidering, that their Law, that is, their Religion, was written in this Language, conſidering they ever were, and to this day are, a Nation ſo ſtubbornly tenacious of their Religion and Law; conſidering, laſtly, that no ſmall numbers amongſt them, as juſt now was ſaid, made the Reading and Copying of their Law, the buſineſs of their life, (did ſo in our Saviours time, have done ſo ſince) it is not credible, the Reading of it ſhould in that period have been loſt: And if not then loſt, never. Secondly,

Secondly, As to *Hebrew words* §. XIII.
having *ſeveral ſignifications*, 'tis very ſure ſome of them have: but ſo have the words in all Languages, which are known to have been commonly ſpoken upon the face of the Earth; at leaſt 'tis notorious the ſame may be ſaid, of either *Greek* or *Latin*. And we know, even in them, as well as in the more modern *Lingua's*, we are daily put to it, from the ſcope of the diſcourſe, and the juncture of ſome words with other, *&c.* to determin the true acceptation or ſenſe. Which in our Tranſlating the Hebrew text, if we cannot do, we ordinarily ſet down both, or all the ſenſes, one in the Text and the other in the Margin of our Tranſlations. So that this is no juſt plea, either againſt the Hebrew,

brew, or our Tranſlations thereof. We may take the Hebrew, where dubious, in all the ſenſes it will bear: and our Tranſlations (the modern ones eſpecially, and above others, the *Engliſh*) ſet down the ſeveral ſenſes. So does not the Septuagint (however highly contended for by ſome) which always confines us to one of the ſeveral ſenſes, and ſometimes miſſes all of them. In a word, our Tranſlations have, or may have, all the Senſes the preſent Originals can bear, and beſides them, any which Antient Verſions or Gloſſes can probably affix to the Originals. But it is to be feared, ſome men are enemies, for Enmities ſake.

§. XIV. Thirdly, As to the *difference* pleaded betwixt our *preſent Reading*, and what is pretended to have

have been our *Saviour's* and his *Apoſtles rendring* the *Hebrew text*, this may indeed ſtumble or gravel ſome who do not conſider the following particulars. (1.) That it is a *great miſtake* to ſay, our *Lord* himſelf *made uſe of the Septuagint*, or, as far as can be proved, any other *Greek Verſion* imaginable; becauſe the Authors of the Scriptures of the New Teſtament have done ſo. For he being by Nation a *Jew*, and preaching only *to the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael*, as being an *Apoſtle of the Circumciſion* (according to S. *Paul's* term of him) certainly ſpoke the Language of the then *Jews*, and preached to them therein; which haply, though not ſtrictly Hebrew, was yet a Dialect of it, namely, Syriack. And this appears from a multitude of paſſages

ſpoken by him, extant in the Greek Teſtament without change, as often as thoſe Authors thought fit to record the numerical ſyllables uttered by him: ſuch are *Racha*, *Mammon*, *Corban*, *Cephas*, *Barjona*, *Talitha Kumi*, *Ephphatha*, *Eli Eli lamma ſabactani*, *&c.* Therefore he in his ordinary preaching, made no uſe of the Septuagint. And it is moſt plain from *Acts* vii. 2. *&c.* and from *ch.* xxi. 40. and from diverſe other places, that the Apoſtles, and their Adjutants, when they preached to the *Jews*, uſed the Hebrew tongue, that is, the Language then common to the *Jews*, called, as a-fore ſuggeſted, in a large ſenſe, Hebrew. And when they preached to others, they had nothing to do to alledge Scripture, much leſs therefore then did they uſe Greek Verſions.

There-

Therefore neither did the Apoſtles, even in their ordinary preaching to the *Jews*, ordinarily uſe the Septuagint. (2.) The main body of the Jewiſh Nation perſiſting in infidelity, and the Goſpel deſigning the Call of the *Gentiles*, it was neceſſary the New Teſtament ſhould be written in another Language than that wherein either the Doctrine of the Old, was firſt recorded, or the Doctrine of the New, as we have ſeen, at firſt, preached: and the *Greek* being then, and in that part of the world, the moſt *univerſal language*, was the fitteſt for this purpoſe. On this occaſion was the New Teſtament written in Greek. Now the Old Teſtament having been before known to have been publickly made *Greek*, by a Council of LXXII *Jews*, (the

number of the Elders in a great *Sanhedrim*) who by the way designed no strict Translation, but rather such a Paraphrastical one as might best recommend their Law and Nation to Foreigners; the Authors of the New Testament finding that Version sufficiently clear, true, and exact for their purpose, chose often times to make use of that, as being known, and in all mens hands, and confest by all to contain the body of the Jewish Religion, rather than to translate a-new, according to strictness, which would have been disputed and contradicted. And on this account the Septuagint, or old Greek Translation, was used so *often* by the Penmen of the New Testament. *So often*, I say; for those who bear the World in hand that the Septuagint

tuagint Verſion is * *always* obſerved by the Authors of the New Teſtament, or even by the Evangeliſts themſelves, it is to be feared, are abuſed perſons, or have not been at pains to examine the particulars. For, it is evident to all perſons of conſideration and diligence in ſuch ſtudies, that theſe Sacred Authors took a * latitude, contenting themſelves with the general ſenſe of the Text, not ſervilely following words: of which, would this Diſcourſe admit, I would give (and poſſibly hereafter ſhall ſubjoin) inſtances numerous enough.

* *See the Appendix to this purpoſe*, A.

* *See Appendix*, B.

In the mean while (3.) That *any Tranſlation* ſhould be of *more Authority* than the *Original*, and the *Original* as *prior*, ſo not *derive Authority* to the *Tranſlation*, is a piece of ſenſe only becoming ſuch

Doctors, who ſcorn all mens reaſons but their own, or are reſolved to ſet up their own Authority without reaſon. If a Record, Decree, or Sentence were to be produced, tranſlated into another Language than that wherein it was conceived, it would certainly be adjudged of ſo much the more validity, by how much more ſtrict accord it could be proved to have with the Original. And the ſame being to be concluded of all Tranſlations in like caſes, the *Hebrew text* muſt, for that reaſon, be of *more Authority* than the *Septuagint*, or *any other Tranſlation* of, or from it ſelf.

§. XV. But that which muſt for ever take off the force of this part of the Objection is, (4.) that the *New-Teſtament-reading* of any Texts,

Texts, which are taken out of the Old, does, if duly examined, at the *laſt reſult*, and in effect, *accord with the Old*; and however different the words appear, the ſenſe is coincident, and the matter comes to the ſame paſs. I will inſtance in a Text of importance, wherein, at firſt ſight, the ſenſe ſeems very different, yet upon a little conſideration, proves, as to matter, the ſame. It is, *Pſal.* xl. 6. We read, *David* there, in the perſon of Chriſt, thus addreſſing himſelf to God, *Sacrifice and offering thou wouldeſt not*, &c. *but mine ears haſt thou opened* [*Digged*, ſaies the Margin, or rather *Bored.*] *Then ſaid I, lo I come*, &c. *to do thy will, O Lord.* This the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews*, following the (Modern Editions, probably, not the Antient Verſion of the) Septuagint, reads,

But a body haſt thou prepared me. Now Opening, Digging or Boring ears, and Preparing a Body, ſeem at firſt widely diſtant Notions: but in regard of our Lord's *incarnation* and *obedience to death, even the death of the Croſs*, (the ſubject he had in hand) they are in effect much identick or equivalent. In other terms, "That I "might in all things accompliſh "and be obedient to thy will, "thou haſt framed me an Or-"ganiſed body, in which particu-"larly thou haſt made me paſſa-"ges for the receiving (or hear-"ing) thy commands; that is, "thou haſt digged or bored my "ears. Framing of ears was a part of framing the body, and ſo Synecdochically the ſame. And he had reaſon rather to take that part of formation, than any other, for

for the whole, becauſe he deſigned thereby to expreſs prophetically the *Meſſias*'s quickneſs and promptneſs to Obedience, and offering himſelf up upon the Croſs. Or otherwiſe; *Mine ears haſt thou bored*, that is, "according "to the Ceremony of perpetua-"ting mens ſervices, thou haſt, "by my free conſent and volun-"tary propoſition, taken me as "thy Servant, which that I might "be, it was neceſſary I ſhould take "the form of a Servant, the Hu-"mane Nature: wherefore thou "haſt prepared me a body, which "I may offer in obedience to thy "will. The preparing the Son a body was as plain a Teſtification that he was made a Servant, as to the ordinary Menial was the Boring of the Ear. By either of theſe ſhort Paraphraſes (others have made

made larger) we ſee the diſcrepancy is naturally removed, either phraſe being the ſame in effect, and both pertinent to the ſcope or deſign of the whole Paragraph. And the like accommodation might be made of other ſeemingly diſcordant paſſages, would the bounds of this diſcourſe permit.

§. XVI. To put into one, all which has been ſaid to this laſt Objection. The ſumm of our Anſwer is: Our Saviour and his Apoſtles, in their ordinary preaching to the *Jews*, uſed not the Septuagint, (part therefore of what our Adverſaries object is falſe) in the Penning of the Goſpel or New Teſtament; becauſe a then received, though not exact, Verſion, was [*Argumentum ad Homines*] a fit

fit proof to many of that age and people, and would, beſides, ſerve well enough for all in general; the Verſion of the Septuagint was uſed ordinarily, and yet very * frequently deſerted. (There is therefore ſtill more falſity in our Adverſaries clamours.) But it were Non-ſenſe to infer hence, as ſome do, that therefore the Septuagint is more Authentick than the Hebrew, that is, a Tranſlation than its Original. Beſides, after all this coil, the authority both of Old Teſtament and New ſtands firm, above the attempts of its enemies, Wit, Learning or Malice. For generally in both, the Senſe is the ſame, the way of expreſſing only different. The Old Teſtament, as extant in our *Engliſh* Bibles is tranſlated Grammatically, or, in a manner, word for word:

* *See herein the Appendix*, A.

word: What is produced out of the Old, in the New Teſtament, is often a Paraphraſe of the Original text, as being tranſlated from a kind of *Greek* Paraphraſe (rather than a ſimple Verſion) commonly called the Septuagint, and thence ariſes that ſeeming diſcrepancy.

I conclude therefore, upon the whole, the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament to be a ſure word of Prophecy, notwithſtanding thoſe loud imputations of Corruptions, of various Readings, of None or Indeterminate ſenſe: All which imputations, for the main, are falſe; and where they are not, affect not any conſiderable ſubſtantial part of Scripture (that is, of DIVINE VERITY) or point of Chriſtian Faith and Practice. And the ſame by the premiſes is con-

concluſible alſo of the New Teſtament: Therefore Scripture is Authentick.

It remains now in the next §. XVII.
place to propound terms, on which we may be *aſcertained* of our *Faith* from the Scriptures, which have been thus proved to be ſure: And they ſhall be very brief, few and reaſonable terms, which I will propound.

The firſt Article ſhall be, *That in all controverted points of Faith,* (for there are points of Faith, at leaſt points which ſome men obtrude on our Faith, that are controverted and rejected too, very commonly and juſtly:) I ſay, that in ſuch controverted points of Faith, *That doctrine, wherein both Originals and Tranſlations generally agree, whether in a deep ſilence or*

a

a contradiction thereof, be adjudged either ſpurious or no point of Faith. This will at once *ſtrike off* all the *new Articles of the Tridentine Creed,* (I mean, the Creed framed from the Decrees of the Council of *Trent*) together with all Doctrines favoured there, though not expreſly decreed for Faith, but ſince improved and received as Faith by the *Romaniſts.* And particularly, the *Popes Infallibility* will be gone: for if Scripture had aſſerted *Infallibility* to any *Vicegerents of God on earth,* it would be to *Kings,* not to Popes, Prov. xvi. 10. *A Divine Sentence is in the lips of the King, his mouth tranſgreſſeth not in judgment.* Which text, though it manifeſtly reſtrain it ſelf to the Adminiſtration of Civil juſtice (wherein none of our Church ever thought of any Appeal from

a

a Royal Decree, or in any other caſe of reſiſtance to the Royal Authority;) yet doth it ſuppoſe a more generally infallible conduct and ſuperintendency of God's Providence over the Decrees of Kings, than is any where in Holy Scripture aſſerted over the Sentences or Determinations of any other Judges on Earth in any cauſe whatſoever. And I would fain ſee produced from any part of Holy (yea even of Apocryphal) Writ, ſo fair and expreſs a Text, for an Infallibility of Popes, or any other on Earth: But this by the bye.

Secondly, I propound only further, *That whatſoever, Originals and Tranſlations generally agree in aſſerting as neceſſary to be believed or done, in order to Salvation, be admitted as ſuch.* And I am ſure then,

then, the *whole Doctrine* (both of *Faith* and *Practice*) of the *Proteſtants* ſtands eſtabliſht. For our *Foundation* is *Scripture*, and that *interpreted by the Univerſal Tradition* of the Church in its *firſt and pureſt ages*, even when the boldeſt Adverſaries we have dare not ſay, thoſe corruptions of Scripture, of which now they make ſo clamorous pretences, were in being: and in Scripture our Foundation is not dubious Texts, perplext with Criticiſms, uncertain by various Readings, ſuſpected for Corruptions, Interpolations, *&c.* but plain, expreſs, undoubted and repeated ones. And as long as our Foundation thus is Scripture, if that be a ſure Word, our Faith is ſure.

Whe-

Whether then ſome men diſpute againſt Scripture, meerly out of wantonneſs, and to ſhew their Learning, or for other ends, it concerns not us to enquire. But both they, and all our Enemies, muſt know, 'tis paſt time of day, to put us out of conceit with our Bibles, or to perſwade them out of our Hands or Hearts. *Græcum eſt, non poteſt legi*, might down in *Monkiſh ages*, it will *not now*; no not even with thoſe whom ſome diſdainfully (and with a greater pride than is due to the Merits of their own Learning) call *Laicks*. And God be bleſſed for this glorious Light. Upon the whole therefore, We remain ſure both of our Scriptures, and of our Faith. §. XVIII.

§. XIX. And here, by the way, I muſt take the liberty to ſay, *All other* imaginable *ways* of making us *ſure of our Faith*, without Scripture, in the preſent ſtate of things, are *idle and vain*. And whatever carries any plauſible pretence of certainty, will, at length, reſolve it ſelf into this of Scripture. There has been a long time, and ſtill is, a great cry in the world about *Tradition*: But if we look into the caſe, it is not *Tradition* (that is, the *Conſtant conſent of the Antient and Catholick Church*) which the *Romaniſts* have to vouch for their preſent *Traditions* [or *peculiar Doctrines*] but the late *corrupt uſe*, and bold *ſay-ſo* of their Church. Thus in the Council of *Trent*, when the Evidence of any of theſe their new

(at

(at leaſt comparatively new) Doctrines had been ſifted, and could be found, neither in Scripture, nor Fathers, or any antient Councils; it was but ſaying the point was ſo held or practiſed by the Church, and the Church was Infallible; therefore being the Church taught it, it muſt be *an Apoſtolick Tradition*, though not extant in Scripture: and ſo whatever they pleaſed to give this venerable name to, was thereby preſently dub'd an Article of Faith.

And particularly thus was the matter carried, in the queſtion of the *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, of the preſent *Canon of the Maſs*, of the *Sacraments* of *Penance* and *Extreme Unction*, in the *Interdict of Prieſts marriage*, not to name more points of like nature. For

if indeed, truly named, that is *Universal* Tradition [*Quod ubiq; quod semper, quod ab omnibus, &c.*] were the thing urged upon us, we are and ever have been as much for it as any men. To this day we cry; Let us go to tryal, on this issue, in the name of God. But such Tradition as this, we shall find, amongst all the controverted points, only for Scripture. I will be bold to say, we have not so unvariable Tradition for the *Articles of the Creed*, which we call the *Apostles* Creed, as we have in behalf of the *Books* of the *Old and New Testament*. So that according to these measures, we are but where we were before. Universal Tradition must prescribe our Faith, and so absolutely Universal Tradition we have for no point controverted, but for the

Origi-

Original Scriptures, nay, indeed, ſcarcely for any other point of Faith ſo uniformly. Original Scripture therefore, as before, ſtill ſtands unſhaken.

§. xx. But theſe Rules, will ſome ſay, are for *Learned men*, who underſtand, and can ſearch Originals, compare Verſions, and ſee wherein they agree: What ſhall the unlearned *Common people do*? I ſay ſtill, *Keep to your Engliſh Tranſlation*, good people: *keep to what you are.* Your *Engliſh Bibles* to you, are the *ſureſt word of Prophecy and Goſpel too*, that you can meet with. The *Tranſlation* of the *Old Teſtament* has been confeſt by Foreigners, of excellent judgment [*uſque ad invidiam aliarum gentium elaborata*] Accurate even to the envy of other Nations: That of the

Gospels is no less so: especially taking in the Margin. And though it were to be wisht, the *Epistles* had been translated with that strictness according to the letter, and so unbyast judgment, with which the other parts of our Bibles are; yet this may be said even as to them; What the Text has less exact (according to the Original) or dubious, not only the *Margin*, but the very *different Character* of several *words in the Text*, directs to a genuin or wholesome sense of. My meaning is, whereas it is not possible to translate Hebrew or Greek into English strictly word for word, and to make such translation sense (the Idiom or propriety of the languages so vastly differing, that we must in English put in several particles or little words to make good

good ſenſe with us) all thoſe words ſo put in, or ſupplied, are printed ordinarily in a different ſort of letter from the reſt; by which means we may eaſily diſcover any word that is not in the Original, and from ſuch diſcovery know, what weight to lay upon that text ſo tranſlated. So that there is no danger of peoples miſcarrying in their Faith, who humbly and ſoberly keep to their Engliſh Bibles, which God be bleſſed now we have extremely cheap and frequent in our hands. Only the people are here to be minded in caſe of doubts, to have recourſe to their ſpiritual Guides.

By theſe means then we are, or may be, as ſure of our Faith from Scriptures, as we are of the Scriptures themſelves.

§. XXI. Now, To put a due *Concluſion* to this Diſcourſe; there are ſome *Chriſtian Practices*, which the ſcope of it does naturally recommend, and *ſome advices* which it may *occaſion*.

And Firſt, Let the reflexion on what has been diſcourſed touching the certainty of Holy Scriptures, and their Authentick Verity, raiſe in our hearts a due *Eſteem* and *Cordial Reverence* of them, as not being from Man, nor, meerly, by man, but *given by inſpiration of God*, and in a peculiar and marvellous manner, preſerved and *tranſmitted by his ſpecial Providence* from age to age, through multitudes of hands down to us, who live probably near the end of time. It was

was once the great priviledge of the *Jews*, that to them *were committed the Oracles of God*: that priviledge is now common to us, with them. Though perhaps therefore we may not keep thoſe Oracles with ſo ſuperſtitious a care and curioſity as they did; yet let us both keep, and treat them with as *cordial adherence*, and as *awful eſteem*. But eſpecially, let us take care that we uſe not paſſages out of them, in our ordinary diſcourſe, ſlightingly, in Jeſt and Drollery, to create Laughter to our ſelves and others. Holy things ſhould not be plaid with: and we are to remember, that if we do play with them, we teach people to think we do not believe them to be Holy.

Secondly,

Secondly, Let not *a Prize be put into our hands, and we ſuch fools as not to have hearts to uſe it:* Have we the *Word of Prophecy,* ſurer than other Miraculous Revelation; Have we the *Goſpel of Truth* too, both mutually confirming and confirmed by one another, and ſhall we be ſo idle and groſs, as to be any of us in a manner uncapable of uſing either? Why ſhould there be a perſon in a Chriſtian Church or Nation, to whom the Holy Scripture ſhould be as a Book ſealed, who ſhould know no more, by the Book open and laid before him, than if faſt cloſed up; I mean who ſhould not be able, himſelf to read, the glad tidings and terms of his Salvation? Good people, deny not your ſelves that, which an excellent Perſon has

moſt

moſt juſtly ſtiled, the CHRISTIANS BIRTH-RIGHT, the uſe of Holy Scriptures. Take care and endeavour, that both you and yours be able to read. And being ſo, whatever Book you read not through, or rarely look into, let not the Bible be that neglected one. Rather account ſuch a day loſt, in which you have not attentively and conſiderately read ſome part thereof.

Thirdly, Remember him who ſaid, *Hold faſt till I come, that no man take thy Crown.* He ſits at the right hand of his Father, ready to give it, and will in good time come and give it us, if we faint not,

And Laſtly, As moſt excellent means to inſure to our ſelves a right uſe of Scriptures, and to pre-

preſerve us from miſinterpreting or miſapplying them, let us be careful of the two following particulars.

Firſt, To furniſh our minds with a *form of ſound Doctrine*, gathered out of Holy Scripture. This, it is to be hoped, we had in ſome degree in our early years by *Catechiſm*, and without this, both Scripture and Sermons are in a great meaſure unſerviceable. It is the Apoſtle's Rule, that they who *Propheſie* (that is in the New Teſtament notion of Propheſying, interpret Scripture) do it *according to the proportion of Faith*, Rom. xii. 6. his meaning ſeems to be, that underſtanding, firſt, the ſeveral Articles of Chriſtian Faith, we ſhould interpret or take Scripture in conſiſtency there-

therewith. This rule will prevent the abuſe of Holy Scripture to Errour and Novelty.

Secondly, To endeavour the *Honeſt and Impartial practice* of what we know, in the fear of God, and as we ſhall anſwer the not Doing according to our Lords will, when we have known That his will. This moſt aſſuredly will prevent Scriptures being uſeleſs; and beſides will both lead us to an higher pitch of knowledge, and ſecure us from any dangerous Errours. For amongſt *other parts of Chriſtian duty*, we ſhall then practice *Meekneſs*, *Humility*, and a low conceit of our ſelves: we ſhall not therefore too much lean to our own underſtanding, we ſhall not exceed our own meaſures; And then (Pſal. xxv. 9, 14.)

The

The meek will the Lord guide in judgment, the meek will he teach his way. The ſecret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will ſhew them his Covenant.

Theſe are the great Uſes we ſhould make of this ſure Word of *Prophecy, Law and Goſpel*, to value and reverence it; in teſtimony thereof, to capacitate not only our ſelves, but all ours, by moderate, at leaſt, the loweſt degree of Learning (being able to read) to make uſe of it, and then diligently to read it, and hold it faſt: But eſpecially by getting into our minds a form of ſound words (a due underſtanding Catechetical doctrine) and by living according to what we know, to enſure to our ſelves the right uſe of it.

And

And if we thus take heed to this ſure word, 'tis ſure we ſhall do well: We ſhall be *ſure* not only of *our Faith*, but of the *End of it* too; We ſhall be certainly and unſpeakably rewarded in Glory and Bliſs everlaſtingly.

Which God grant, &c.

FINIS.

BRITISH MUSEUM

FINIS.

APPENDIX.

CHAP. I.

IT is not at all the Design of the following Papers to expose or vilifie the Greek Translation of the Old Testament, made by LXXII Elders of the *Jewish* Nation near three hundred years before Christ, and commonly called the Septuagint; but rather to leave it in the possession of what is its just and undoubted right, the First and Highest place amongst all the Antient Versions. Only reserving, in the mean while, and Asserting, to the Original Hebrew its precedency, as well in

Authority as Age; and consequently, to all modern Translations from it, a degree of Authority proportionable to their Accord with it; both which (I mean the Hebrew Original, and modern Translations) have been strangely trampled upon by some, in their undue cariere of zeal for the Septuagint.

The great Argument they urge, is the Use, which the Pen-men of the New Testament make of the Septuagints Version, in those Texts which they produce out of the Law and the Prophets. Boldly they have affirmed, that *the Evangelists, Apostles, and the whole Christian Church by perpetual consent have acknowledged the Truth of the Septuagints Version*: And hence they would inferr, that *no where of right we may depart from it.*

Nay,

Nay, not only all of the preſent Age, who prefer the Original to it, but even S. *Hierom* himſelf is ſeverely cenſured for ſo doing, and *the Authority of any one of thoſe Seventy Interpreters* (for it is ſuppoſed that ſome ſingle perſons of them came ſeveral times into *Egypt*, and tranſlated the Prophets and *Hagiographa*, the whole LXXII having at firſt tranſlated only the Pentateuch:) the Authority, I ſay, of any ſingle perſon of thoſe Elders is avowed *of greater credit than all the Synagogues of the Jews ſince that time*, or all the *Learning of the Rabbies* their *Followers.*

This *Argument* I have in effect *denyed*: and on the contrary, *Truly I have affirmed*, (§. 14.) "That "the Sacred Pen-men of the New "Teſtament, have not always fol-

"lowed the Septuagints Verſion, "that they very commonly take "a Latitude, and content them- "ſelves with the general ſenſe of "the Text, not indeed following "either that, or any other Verſi- "on, that we know of, then ex- "tant. And *hence I would infer*, that the Authority of the Sep- tuagint is not ſo Sacred as theſe men pretend, it having not ſo conſtant Vouchers as aſſerted; nay, it being left oftner by the Evangeliſts than followed; and eſpecially left, in moſt of thoſe Texts, which, by peculiar circumſtances, prove our Jeſus to have been the true Meſſias; which Texts, in the preſent Septuagint, are for the moſt part vitiouſly rendred, but in the Original He- brew are intire, and clear as the Sun: In fine, that the Original there-

therefore is to be acknowledg'd the only Authentick Old Teſtament.

Now, becauſe I will not, as ſome, expect to be believed upon my meer ſaying ſo: for a Tryal of the truth herein, we will take, at a venture, the ten firſt Texts, by each Evangeliſt reported out of the Old Teſtament, and collating them, both with the Septuagint and the Hebrew, as we ſhall find them, in particular, to accord with or recede from each or either, we will for the preſent make a more general Eſtimate. I could willingly have taken more, but theſe will ſuffice to try an ordinary Reader's Patience, as well as give us a proof what we might expect in the reſt, were all examined.

And for more clear proceeding herein, let it in the firſt place be

granted, or ſuppoſed, that where the Phraſe, or principal Terms, in any Text are altered, however the ſame ſenſe be ſtill kept, there the Tranſlation of ſuch Text is not the ſame. For if both Phraſe and Senſe ſhould be altered, it would no longer be a different Tranſlation, but different Text. The alteration therefore of the Phraſe, or of the principal Terms, is ſufficient to warrant the name of a different Tranſlation.

This being taken for a Foundation, the Propoſitions which we are to prove, are diſtinctly theſe two:

I. That the Evangeliſts do not always follow the Septuagints Tranſlation.

And for clearer caſting up the account, let this Propoſition be known by the letter *A*.

So

So that where ever it ſtands in the Margin, there may be obſerved an inſtance of this Propoſitions being verified.

II. That they uſed a Liberty, or took a Latitude, not following ever the expreſſions of any other known Tranſlation, or indeed of the Original it ſelf, but contenting themſelves generally to report (ſometimes only to alude to) the Senſe of ſuch or ſuch Texts, as they had occaſion to make uſe of. And let not this be thought the worſe of, becauſe it was of old S. *Jerome*'s doctrine, who may be thought a party: *The holy Apoſtles and Evangeliſts*, ſaith he, *commonly alledge Teſtimonies out of the Old Teſtament, according to the Senſe, not the Words:*

as indeed do the Fathers, and moſt Writers, out of all Authors.

And, as the other, let this Propoſition be known by its letter, *viz. B.* And further, becauſe upon this Enquiry there will ariſe matter of fact, which will prove other Propoſitions, to be treated of anon, all tending to vindicate the Authority of the preſent Hebrew Text (which I contend to be the Original, and alone Authentick) for the better making up out account, therein, alſo, let *C* ſignifie the ſingle Concord of the Evangeliſts and Septuagint: but *C C* the Concord of all three, Hebrew, Septuagint and Evangeliſts: and † Texts perverted in the Septuagint.

And

And now in the name of God, let us examine all without Prejudice or Partiality, not ſolicitous for Victory but Truth.

CHAP. II.

Texts produced out of the Old Teſtament by S. Matthew.

THE firſt Teſtimony S. *Matthew* alledges out of the Old Teſtament, is from *Iſai.* vii. 14. This in the Hebrew runs (ſtrictly enough according to our Tranſlation) *Behold a Virgin ſhall conceive and bear a Son, and thou ſhalt call his name Emmanuel.* In the Septuagint it runs thus, *Behold a Virgin ſhall receive in her womb,* and then word for word, as in the Hebrew. But in the Greek of the

the New Teſtament, *Behold a Virgin ſhall have* [or *carry*] *in her womb*, which ſenſe our Tranſlators in the New Teſtament, *Matth.* i. 23. well expreſs, *ſhall be with child.* I ſay, to conceive, and to be with child, Ἐν γαστρὶ λαμβάνειν & ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν, are different Phraſes, if not things; and of more ſignification, perhaps, here, than at firſt thought of. Had our Lord according to the opinion of the old *Valentinians*, or later *Mennonites* in *Germany*, had only a Celeſtial body, which meerly paſſed through the Virgin *Mary*, not being formed of her ſubſtance; ſhe might have been ſaid to have received it in her womb: But ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν, *to be with child*, being according to common uſe of the Phraſe, properly of Women, who are truly gravid, does more emphati-

phatically assert the Verity of our Lord's Humane Nature, by implying his being carried the full time in the womb; and therefore that his body was nourished, and consequently formed of his blessed Mothers substance, which οὐ γαστὶ λαμβάνει does not. And it may be no wrong to the Holy Ghost, to conceive he guided S. *Matt.* thus in Greek to word his Text, rather than as the Septuagint do. But besides this variation, whereas the Septuagint, keeping close to the Hebrew, have it, *Thou shalt call*, namely, *Thou, O Virgin, shalt call*, תִּקְרְאִי S. *Matthew* here also recedes, and that from both, saying, *They shall call*. And in truth, in the former point, he may be thought, also, to have a little left the Hebrew, as well as Septuagint: for, to *receive in the womb*, which was the

the Septuagints phraſe, more properly expreſſes what we mean by *Conception*, than *being with child*.

A. In ſhort, his receding from the Septuagint in theſe two points, is a proof of the firſt Propoſition;

B. his receding both from Septuagint, and from Hebrew, a proof of the ſecond.

The ſecond Allegation by S. *Matthew* is out of *Micah* v. 2, which is again very well, and naturally, tranſlated from the Hebrew, in our Bibles, thus, *Thou Bethlehem-Ephratha, though thou be little amongſt the thouſands of Judah, yet out of thee ſhall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Iſrael.* The Septuagint here render it, *Thou Bethlehem the houſe of Ephratha art the leaſt, &c.* In the reſt, nearly enough to the Hebrew. But S. *Matthew*, eſpecially

in

in his Greek, recedes from both ſtrangely: *Thou, O Bethlehem, the land of Judah, art in no wiſe the leaſt amongſt the Princes of Judah, Matth.* ii. 6. Beſides the Variation, here is a plain contradiction to the Septuagint. [Οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν ταῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα, Matth. Ὀλιγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰούδα. Sept.] greater difference both in Senſe and Phraſe cannot well be. And in the latter member, excepting the contradiction, the variation is not much leſs. *For out of thee* A. *ſhall come forth a Ruler* [ἡγούμενος, Matth. τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, Sept.] *Who ſhall feed my people* B. *Iſrael.* Except the proper names, here is nothing alike. What, in the name of God, did he think, who aſſerted a *perpetual conſent*?

The third Old Teſtament text is *Hoſea* xi. 1. which we render faith-

faithfully, word for word, out of the Hebrew, thus: *Out of Egypt have I called my son.* But the Septuagint, *I have sent for his children out of Egypt.* S. *Matth.* ii. 15. agrees exactly with the Hebrew, the Septuagint being as foreign to his purpose, as it is to the Original.

A fourth Text is out of *Jerem.* xxxi. 15. in which again the faithfulness of our Translators to the Hebrew, as well as to S. *Matthew*, is to be commended: *In Ramah was there a voice heard, Lamentation and weeping and great mourning,* [*Lamentation and weeping of bitterness,* Hebr.] *Rachel mourning for her children, and* [*refused,* Hebr.] *would not be comforted, because they were not,* *Matth.* ii. 17. He who reads the xxxi. ch. of *Jerem.* in the Septuagints Version, of that Edition

tion at leaſt, which Biſhop *Walton*, judging moſt correct, put into our Polyglott, ſhall find in the whole chapter nothing nearer this Text, than ver. 3. *A voice of people crying out of Oronaim, deſtruction and great breaking in pieces.* But in truth this was not deſigned by the Interpreters as a Tranſlation of what is cited by S. *Matthew*; as belonging to *ch.* 48. 3. For here the Copy is all in confuſion; and this, which ſtands, in order, the xxxi, is indeed the xlviii. And that which ſtands the xxxviii, is legitimately the xxxi. And ſo beſides the Hebrew, and our Bibles from it, even the vulgar Latin, and ſome later Editions of the Septuagint, have it. Now in the ſaid xxxviii. *chap.* v. 15. we have the text we look for, which is there rendred thus: *Rachel all in weeping,* A.

weeping [ἀποκλαιομένη; ſimply without any adjection: not as S. *Matt.* κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς, which perfectly anſwers the Hebrew.] *and would not ceaſe over her children, becauſe they were not.*

A fifth Text is out of *Iſai.* xl. 3. where firſt we find S. *Matthew* to follow the Septuagints Verſion. But the reaſon may well be preſumed to be, becauſe they here
cc. follow the Hebrew: ſo that in this text all three accord; eſpecially if we render נה in the ſenſe our Tranſlators very properly, as I conceive, take it. The little difference there is, is of S. *Matthew*, from both the Original and Septuagint: for he putting the Pronoun for the Noun, contracts the latter clauſe thus. *Make ſtraight his paths*, inſtead of, *make ſtraight the paths of our God*, which word אלהינו

אלהינו *of our God*, very material as it might ſeem, is in both, but omitted by S. *Matthew*. B.

The ſixth and ſeventh Texts, S. *Matthew* produces out of the Old Teſtament (if we wave one, which is mangled by the Devil, as I am apt to think it not diſagreeable to do, inaſmuch as his authority will not much credit any Tranſlation) are ſuch wherein Hebrew, Septuagint and Evangeliſt are all at ſufficient accord. The places are *Deut.* viii. 3. and vi. 16. in S. *Matt.* iv. 4, 7. CC. CC.

The Eighth is, *Deut.* vi. 13. alledged by S. *Matth.* iv. 10, where both Hebrew and Septuagint (and ſo indeed in parallel texts) read, *Thou ſhalt fear the Lord thy God*, but S. *Matthew* gloſſes the word more to his purpoſe, and receding from both, ſaith, *Thou*

A. *ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God.*

B. The Temptation was, *To fall down and worſhip the Tempter, v.9.* And the word *Worſhip*, which is compriſed in the fear of God, προσκυνήσεις, was more pertinent to oppoſe to the temptation, than φοβηθήσῃ of the Septuagint, though that more exactly anſwered תירא the Original. But in the latter clauſe here it is to be noted, that Emphatical reſtrictive term, *only*, is added by the Septuagint, and not in the Original Hebrew: And the Evangeliſt herein follows the

C. Septuagint, not the Hebrew: which is the firſt inſtance we meet with of this kind.

The Ninth is out of *Iſai.* ix. 1. produced by S. *Matthew* iv. 15. Not to ſpeak here of the irreconcileable difference, as it ſeems to me, between the Septuagint and the

the Original, in ſuch turning aſide (I will not ſay perverting) the very ſcope of that whole Paragraph, as makes the principal part of it, if taken according to the Septuagints Verſion unapplicable and impertinent to the Evangeliſts purpoſe, we will only view that part of it, broken off ſhort, which our Evangeliſt alledges---*The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphthali, the way of the Sea beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles. The people which ſat* [ſaith S. *Matth. walked*, Hebr.] *in darkneſs, have ſeen a great light, and to them that ſat in the region* [Hebr. *in the land*] *of the ſhadow of death, light is ſprung up*, or, *hath ſhined.* Thus far exactly do S. *Matthew* and the Hebrew agree. But the Septuagint differ thus ----*The region of Zebulun, the land of Naph-*

thali, and the reſt of the inhabitants of the Sea-coaſt, and Galilee of the nations beyond Jordan. Behold a great light, ye people that walk in darkneſs, and ye that dwell in the region of the ſhadow of death, light ſhall ſhine upon you. Any one may perceive by the *Engliſh*, theſe Tranſlations differ; but the Greek of S. *Matthew*, and of the
A. Septuagint in this text, is much more different than the *Engliſh*: And S. *Matthew* here leaves the Septuagint, and keeps cloſe to the Hebrew.

In our Lord's Sermon on the mount, there are ſeveral conciſe old Precepts, and Doctrinal paſſages rather toucht and alluded to, than any intire text, that I have obſerved, produced. For, the Tenth and laſt inſtance therefore out of S. *Matthew* we will take

take what he alledges, *Chap.* viii. 17. expreſly, and by name, out of *Iſaiah*, *chap.* liii. 4. which had our Tranſlators thought good, might have been rendred word for word out of *Iſaiah*'s Hebrew, as they have rendred it out of S. *Matthew*'s Greek. But I confeſs the text is capable of a double ſenſe, and therefore they did very wiſely, according to the different ſcopes of the Contexts, to give it a double rendring. However in S. *Matthew*'s text, *Himſelf took our infirmities, and bare our ſickneſſes*; every word anſwers to the Hebrew. But the Septuagint have tranſlated every word different (more pertinently, perhaps, to the Prophets ſcope, than to the Evangeliſts) thus. *This* [perſon Οὗτος, not Αὐτὸς] *bears our ſins, and is grieved concerning us.* S. *Matthew*

therefore leaves their tranſlation, and himſelf, as far as we know, tranſlates a-new.

And now to ſumm up our Evidence out of S. *Matthew*: It is plain in ſeven Texts of Ten,
7 *A.* he forſakes the Septuagint, and in diverſe of them, as all reaſon induces us to think, becauſe they therein forſake the Hebrew, which he rather follows. In the other three of the Ten, we find S. *Mat-*
3 *CC.* *thew*, Hebrew and Septuagint all accord. In four of thoſe inſtances wherein S. *Matthew* tranſlates a-new, he takes that liberty which we aſſerted, receding in part from
4 *B.* the very Hebrew it ſelf, in expreſſion, I mean, though not ſo much in ſenſe. Finally, we have one inſtance, and that only, in one reſtrictive particle, which he
1 *C.* takes out of the Septuagints Verſion,

ſion, not to be found in the Hebrew, but very pertinent and emphatical to his purpoſe.

Therefore, I. the Authors or Pen-men of the New Teſtament, do not always, or with a *perpetual conſent*, follow the Septuagints Verſion: but II. They take ſuch Latitude or Liberty, as ſeemed good to the Holy Spirit of God: which were the points to be demonſtrated.

CHAP. III.

Texts produced out of the Old Teſtament by S. Mark.

SAINT *Mark* in the very beginning of his Goſpel, produces two Teſtimonies (indeed out of two Prophets, but) ſo, as

they would ſeem at firſt ſight only one continued Prophecy.

The firſt is out of *Malach.* iii. 1. and in the Hebrew, it runs thus. *Behold, I ſend my meſſenger, and he ſhall prepare* [as by ſweeping or cleanſing] *the way before my face.* This the Septuagint thus render, *Behold I ſend forth my meſſenger, and he ſhall view the way before my face.* S. *Mark* paraphraſes it thus,
A. *Behold, I ſend,* [Ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω, Mark. Only Ἐξαποστέλλω, Sept.] *my meſſenger before thy face, who ſhall prepare thy way before thee.* A liberty
B. not only altering the words and Tranſlation, but enlarging the ſenſe at that rate, which nothing but preſent inſpiration could warrant. He follows neither Septuagint nor Hebrew.

The ſecond is the ſame with the fifth, out of S. *Matthew*, wherein S.

S. *Mark* exactly agrees with his brother Evangeliſt; even to the uſe of the Pronoun, inſtead of the Hebrew emphatical Noun; both of them, in that minute difference, receding from Hebrew as well as Septuagint. But this difference is not ſufficient to juſtifie any mans ſaying, they here left the Verſion of the Seventy. Wherefore we will account all here agreed. cc.

There is a glance at a paſſage of *Iſaiah*, *Mark* iv. 12. but the text not ſo directly cited as in S. *John*: we will therefore defer the Examination of it, till we meet with it there. And ſuppoſing we paſs that; the third text produced by S. *Mark* out of the Old Teſtament, as far as I have obſerved, is *Iſai.* xxix 13. which, as to what is made uſe of by this Evan-

Evangeliſt, runs thus, in the Hebrew. *This people —honour me with their lips, but have removed their heart from me, and their fear towards me is taught by the precept of men,* as our Tranſlators have rendred it: or, more ſtrictly, *their fear towards me, is a taught precept of men.* And in the Septuagint thus, *This people ----they honour me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worſhip me, teaching commandments of men, and doctrines.* This laſt clauſe indeed, S. *Mark ch.* vii. 6, 7. (we will ſuppoſe for perſpicuities ſake) a little alters, varying the order of the words, and omitting the conjunction (which makes no inconſiderable variation of the
B. Septuagints ſenſe, indeed meliorates it, and is an inſtance of the liberty he uſed) thus, *Teaching*

for

for doctrines [or, as *Doctrines*] *the commandments of men.* In the reſt, word for word he keeps to the Septuagint, who undoubtedly, as *Grotius* well conjectures, for תהי read, as eaſily they might in old Manuſcripts, ותהו, and according to that reading they naturally enough rendred the text as they did, *and in vain do they worſhip me*: for ſo read, it runs word for word thus, *and in vain is their fear* [that is, *worſhip*] *towards me.* Then the participle Διδάσκοντες, teaching, was neceſſary to be ſupplied in the latter clauſe, (which their miſreading, or otherwiſe reading the former, had involved) to make the conſtruction more commodious, the ſenſe remaining ſtill the ſame. c.

The fourth paſſage is out of the Decalogue, *Exod.* xx. 12. wherein

cc. wherein all accord: only in that explicatory Supplement to this command, out of *Exod.* xxi. 17. *He that curſeth father or mother*; S. *Mark ch.* vii. 10. changes the verb from the Indicative to the Imperative, and more agreeably to the ſtile of a Law-giver, reads Θανάτῳ τελευτάτω, *Let him dy the death*: but this difference is not worthy to come into account.

The fifth inſtance of any intire Text alledged (not to ſpeak of places meerly referred to, or toucht upon, where it is uncertain, whether the Evangeliſt more ey'd the Original or Septuagint) is touching the inſtitution of Marriage, *Mark* x. 6, 7, 8. Wherein again all three exactly accord: excepting only, that the Septuagint ſeem to have taken one ſmall, but

but Emphatical word, out of the 25. *verſe*, and put it into the 24. of *Geneſ.* ii. for they read, *They two ſhall be one fleſh. Two*, is not in the Hebrew, but notwithſtanding, taken from the Septuagint by our Evangeliſt, as being indeed very much to his purpoſe. *c.*

The ſixth inſtance is again in the Decalogue, and therein of the Repetition of the whole ſecond Table, ſummarily, *Mark* x. 19. Now the difference herein, is greater in the Greek of theſe Writers, than it appears in the Engliſh: ſo that we may ſafely ſay, the Tranſlation is not the ſame with the Septuagint. The prohibitive particle, the mood or way of ſpeaking, all along is changed, and the order of the Precepts totally inverted. And finally, inſtead of the Tenth Command-

mandment, Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, *Thou ſhalt not covet*, in which the Septuagint exactly follow the He-
A. brew, S. *Mark* has Μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, *Defraud not*, or, *Deprive not*; A manifeſt Variation, and no doubt deſigned to teach us what kind of Coveting is chiefly forbid in that command, namely, the nouriſhing ſuch deſires as put us upon contrivances to obtain what is our Neighbours, or to get to our
B. ſelves, by depriving others of their right. A paſſage very remarkable. And this liberty even in the very text of the Decalogue, or Moral law it ſelf; I may ſay nothing, but our Lord's Authority, as the Chriſtian Law-giver, or preſent inſpiration could have warranted.

The ſeventh Teſtimony which S. *Mark* produces, we find in *Chap.*

Chap. xi. 17. out of *Iſai.* lvi. 7. and the Eighth, *Chap.* xii. 10. out of *Pſalm* cxviii. 21. In both which there is no variation at all between Hebrew, Septuagint or Evangeliſt. cc. cc.

The Ninth is in S. *Mark, Chap.* xii. 19. where he expreſly indeed refers to the old Law, but we cannot think by his reporting it, he lookt upon himſelf concern'd to produce the words of the text. That Law we find extant, *Deut.* xxv. 5. Where in the Hebrew it is, *If he have no Son*; in the Septuagint, *If he have no Seed*; In S. *Mark, If he leave no children.* And again, *ver.* 7. The office of the ſurviving brother is termed in the Hebrew and Septuagint, *Raiſing up his brothers name,* [Ἀναςῆσαι τὸ ὄνομα τῦ ἀδελφῦ.] by S. *Mark, Raiſing up ſeed unto his brother.*

[Ἐξανα-

[Ἐξαναστῆσαι σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ.] Indeed in an Hiſtorical relation of this cuſtom, before it was paſt into a formal Law, *Geneſ.* xxxviii. 8. both Hebrew and Septuagint have, with a very ſmall difference, this latter phraſe. However this muſt be allowed a proof of the liberty he takes, to report the
B. ſenſe, not the words, of the Law, and ſo not to confine himſelf to any Tranſlation.

The laſt inſtance I will alledge out of S. *Mark* is, *Chap.* xii. 26. where he repeats God's words, *Exod.* iii. 6. which in the Septuagint run thus, *I am God of Abraham, God of Iſaac, and God of Jacob.* The Text conſiſting of proper names, there could not well be greater Variation, than by putting in all along the Article, which here bears a great Emphaſis

is to the purpose, for which our Lord alledged that Testimony; and that S. *Mark* does, reporting it thus; *I am the God* [ὁ Θεὸς] *of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.* A.

So that in summ: in Ten Texts out of S. *Mark*, we have three, wherein the Evangelist manifestly recedes from, or alters the Septuagints Translation. 3 A.

We have four, wherein both, Hebrew, Septuagint, and Gospel all agree. 4 CC.

We have two in which he may be said properly to follow the Septuagint, because he keeps to their Version, even as to what is not in the Hebrew in terms. 2 C.

And we have, to omit other less variations, four instances of the liberty (in two of them, very great) which he takes, in leaving both Hebrew 4 B.

and Septuagint. Whereby it is evident, the Holy Ghoſt did not intend, in the ſtile of the New Teſtament, to Canonize any Tranſlation by a conſtant and perpetual obſervation of it. *Q. E. D.*

CHAP. IV.

Texts out of the Old Teſtament cited by S. Luke.

THE firſt is in his Firſt *Chap. ver.* 16, 17. where he evidently cites a Verſe or two out of the Prophet *Malachi*, but with ſuch liberty as I have aſſerted. The Text in the Hebrew runs thus.

thus. *Malach.* iv. 5, 6. *Behold I ſend you Elijah the Prophet.——— And he ſhall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers.* The Septuagints Verſion in this Chapter is very diſorderly, and perhaps has ſuſtained wrong: but I ſhall, as juſtly as I can, repreſent their rendring theſe words. *Behold, I will ſend unto you, Elias the Tiſhbite.* [A very corrupt Addition, whoſe, or with what deſign, God knows. Sure it is, that the Jewiſh Rabbies teach, and particularly *David Kimchi* upon this very Text, that *Elias* the *Tiſhbite*'s ſoul is to come into a body, created like the former, which he had, and that he is to appear, and call together the *Jews* from the ſeveral parts of the world immediately

before the coming of the *Meſſias*; Three days before, ſay ſome of them. Now how excellently the Verſion of the Septuagint favours this Fable, and whether this be not Ῥαββινομαρεῖν, to dote with, or on, the Rabbies, as ſome body taxes others to do, let the world judge. The Angel, in S. *Luke*, expreſly interprets the Prophecy of S. *John* the Baptiſts coming in the Spirit, and power of *Elias*, *&c.* But enough of this. The Septuagint again proceed, miſinterpreting.] *Who ſhall reſtore the heart of the father to the ſon, and the heart of a man to his neighbour.* How ſtrangely different from what we heard in the Prophet, and from what we find in S. *Luke*'s Text! who tells us an Holy Angel ſpoke to *Zachary*, the father of *John* the Baptiſt, con-

concerning his ſon, thus: *He ſhall go before him* [that is, *John* the Baptiſt before Chriſt] *in the Spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children* [ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα· ſtrictly according to the Original. Not, ἀποκαταστῆσαι καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν, as the Septuagint have ordered it.] *and the diſobedient to the wiſdom of the juſt.* A free paraphraſe as to this latter clauſe. A. B.

The Second Text alledged by S. *Luke*, is in *Chapter* ii. 23. where he tells us: *It is written in the Law of the Lord, every male that openeth the womb ſhall be called holy to the Lord.* Now who would not expect to find this text in the Law, Hebrew or Greek, word for word? Yet is the ſenſe only, not the words,

written there. *The firſt-born, that openeth every matrice*, as the Septuagint exactly according to the Hebrew render it [Πρωτογενὲς διανοῖγον πᾶσαν μήτραν.] is commanded to be *ſanctified to the Lord*. *Exodus* xiii. 1. wherefore it may be juſtly ſaid, 'tis called Holy. Let us look further, and *verſe* 12. we find that Law repeated as to Beaſts, thus; Πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν, τὰ ἀρσενικὰ τῷ κυρίῳ. So again *verſe* 15. So *Numbers* viii. 16. But the Text, as S. *Luke* reports it, and ſeems to ſay, 'tis written ſo, I no where find but in him. Wherefore we plainly ſee him uſe a liberty to depart from the
B. words both of Septuagint and Hebrew.

The Third indeed is of ſmall moment, yet to be juſt to our propoſal, we muſt take notice of

of it. *A pair of Turtles* [ζεῦγος τρυγόνων] ſays S. *Luke*, *Chap.* ii. 24. *two Turtles*, ſay both Hebrew and Septuagint. A.

In the Fourth Text, there is a Concord betwixt all, except only in one word. What the Septuagint call Πεδία, *Plains*, nearer the Hebrew, *Iſai.* xl. 4. S. *Luke* ſtiles αὐλὰς λείας, *Chap.* iii. 5. *ſmooth ways.* I do not eſteem this difference worth the accounting. CC.

In the Fifth, S. *Luke* varies a little, both from the Hebrew, and the Septuagints and S. *Matthew*'s Greek. The Hebrew runs thus. *Deut.* viii. 3. *But upon all that proceeds out of the mouth of God, ſhall man live.* The Septuagint gloſs it thus, *upon every word that proceeds, &c.* and S. *Matthew*, as we have ſeen, follows them. S. *Luke* takes it ſhorter, *Chap.* iv. 4.

But by every word of God. I eſteem not this variation worth reckoning, and therefore here again ac-
CC. count an Accord of all.

In the Sixth, I cannot but take notice of the ſame Variation, made by S. *Luke*, both from the Hebrew and Septuagint, which
A. S. *Matthew* alſo made, *Thou ſhalt*
B. *worſhip*, inſtead of, *Thou ſhalt fear*, *Luke* iv. 8. I refer my Reader to the note on S. *Matthew*.

In the Seventh, which was alſo the ſeventh out of S. *Matthew*, we find S. *Luke* to accord with the
CC. Hebrew, Septuagint and S. *Matthew*. 'Tis *Luke* iv. 12. and *Deut.* vi. 16.

The Eighth paſſage, has in it conſiderable both agreement and diſagreement to the Septuagint. 'Tis *Iſai.* lxi. 1, 2. Where, the Septuagint render what is in

the

the Hebrew, *The opening of the priſon to them that are bound*, by *recovery of ſight to the blind.* This ſo different rendring, depends upon a Criticiſm, in the Hebrew word פקח. *To open* [properly ſay the Maſters, *the eyes and ears.*] However S. *Luke* follows it, *Chapter*, iv. 18. But withal, preſently adds another rendring, which plainly ſhews he had the Hebrew text in his eye. *To ſet at liberty* [or ſend away] *them that are bruiſed.* This, I ſay, is not in the Septuagint, and evidently anſwers, though it does not ſtrictly expreſs, the Hebrew *Opening of the Priſon to them that are bound.* So that conſidering both, he may be ſaid here to have followed both Septuagint and Hebrew: taking out of the Septuagint, what was there emphatical c.

to

to his purpoſe, and yet not neglecting what in the Hebrew was not ſo fully tranſlated by the
B. Septuagint, but giving a gloſs of it according to his liberty. And yet again, in this text, he moſt plainly recedes from the Septuagint, in the very next clauſe, rejecting their tranſlation
A. of קרא by καλέσαι, which was not pertinent to the ſcope of the text, and rendring it κηρύξαι, which is both pertinent to the ſcope, and ſtrict juſtice to the word.

The Ninth Old Teſtament Text, which I have obſerved, produced by S. *Luke*, is the ſame with S. *Mark*'s firſt: 'Tis in *Luke* vii. 27. and out of *Malachi* iii. 1. The two Evangeliſts exactly ac-
A. cord, but both recede widely
B. from the Septuagint, on which

for

for the preſent I make no other note than there I did.

In *Luke* viii. 10. there is a ſhort touch upon *Iſai.* vi. 9. as indeed there was in S. *Mark*: but it occurs again more largely in S. *John*: we will therefore at preſent wave the examination thereof; and for the Tenth Teſtimony produced out of the Old Teſtament by S. *Luke*, we will take that which next follows in him, *Chapter* x. 27. which is ſo much the more worthy of our notice, becauſe it is repeated by the two former Evangeliſts, but our meaſure did not reach to it. 'Tis *Deut.* vi. 5. *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy*

Heart---Soul---Might. Hebr.
Mind---Soul---Power. Sept.

Heart

Heart---Soul--Strength, Mind. Luc.
Heart--Soul--Mind, Strength. Mar.
Heart---Soul--Mind. Matth.

Where it is obſervable that our Evangeliſt, firſt, recedes from the Septuagint, as indeed do both the other, to keep with the Hebrew in the firſt term, *with all thine heart.* Secondly, both from
B. the Hebrew and Septuagint in making the Scheme conſiſt of four terms, as alſo doth S. *Mark*; whereas Originally it has but three. And thirdly, he renders מאד by ἰσχύος not δυνάμεως as the
A. Septuagint. Which are ample evidences of his not following, here, the Verſion of the Septuagint.

In ſumm, Of Ten Texts taken by S. *Luke*, out of the Old Teſtament, we find him to recede conſi-

conſiderably from the Septuagint, in ſix; in three we find him to accord both with the Septuagint (though not exactly) and Hebrew; In one, he neither accords with Hebrew nor Septuagint, as to words, but only as to ſenſe, taking the liberty (uſual with all Writers) of his own expreſſion: But beſides this, there are five other inſtances of this liberty, as to ſundry members of Texts. And there is only one inſtance, and that in one clauſe of a Text, wherein he keeps to the Septuagint apart from the Hebrew. Whence I preſume both our Propoſitions again demonſtrated. 6 A. 3 CC. 6 B. 1 C.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Texts of the Old Teſtament cited by S. John.

THE Firſt, *Chapter* i. 23. Here
A. S. *John* recedes both from the Septuagints Verſion, which the other three Evangeliſts exactly followed, and from them alſo. Where they all have, *Prepare ye the way*, (*Iſai.* xl. 3. *Matt.* iii. 3.
B. *Mark* i. 3. *Luk.* iii. 4.) He ſays, *Make ye ſtrait the way*, which was one ſort of preparing it, but not at all, that intimated in the Original Hebrew word.

The Second, I have obſerved S. *John* to produce, is out of

Pſalm

Pſalm lxix. 9. which he reports, *Chapter* ii. 17. exactly according to Hebrew and Septuagint, *&c. The zeal of thine houſe hath eaten me up.*

The third Text by him produced (for of little glances and alluſions no judgment can be made in this caſe) is out of *Iſai.* liv. 13. which the Septuagint, ſupplying the Verb שמרו (as very properly they might) out of *verſe* 12. render, *And I will make---all thy children taught of God.* This Text S. *John* thus reports, *Chap.* vi. 45. *It is written in the Prophets, And they ſhall be all taught of God.* A new Verb, a Pronoun for a Noun (departing, herein, both from Hebrew and Septuagint) and yet the text brought in abruptly, as if it had been written in ſo many words

or

A. or ſyllables. *And they, &c.* 'Tis
B. plain, he intended not to follow the Septuagints Verſion, though he kept both their, and the Original ſenſe.

The fourth Teſtimony is very ſhort, (but with ſuch, out of this Evangeliſt, we muſt be content) from *Pſalm.* lxxxii. 6. produced
C C. *John* x. 34. *I ſaid ye are Gods!* And herein all accord.

The fifth Teſtimony, I have obſerved, ſtill I mean, alledged at any length by *S. John*, is out of *Zech.* ix. 9. which in the Hebrew and Septuagint runs thus: *Rejoice greatly O daughter of Sion, ſhout,* [*Proclaim,* Sept.] *O daughter of Jeruſalem. Behold thy King cometh to thee, Juſt, and having Salvation* [*Saved,* Hebr. *Saving,* Sept.] *is he, lowly* [rather *poor,* Hebr.] *and riding upon an Aſs,*

and

and upon a colt the ſole of Aſſes, [*upon a beaſt accuſtomed to the yoak, and a young ſole,* ſay the Sept.] This † S. *John* hath varied and contracted thus. *Ch.* xii. 15. *Fear not daughter* A. *of Zion, Behold thy King cometh ſit-* B. *ting upon an Aſſes colt.* There are ſcarce three words, and thoſe ſuch too as could not be varied, of the Septuagints Greek, in the Evangeliſts text.

The ſixth Old Teſtament-text, S. *John* has, is again a ſhort one. 'Tis *Iſai.* liii. 1. *Lord who hath believed* CC. *our report? John* xii. 38. And here all agree exactly. Indeed in a text ſo ſhort, and plain, it could not well be otherwiſe. But in

The ſeventh, which is larger, we ſhall find difference enough. The Prophet *Eſaias ſaid again,* ſaith S. *John, Chap.* xii. 40. *He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened*

their heart, that they ſhould not ſee with their eyes, nor underſtand with their heart, and be converted and I ſhould heal them. But *Iſaiah*'s words run thus, *Iſai.* vi. 10. *Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and ſhut their eyes; leſt they ſee with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and underſtand with their hearts, and convert and be healed*; as our Tranſlation, only making the Hebrew Engliſh, excellently renders them. The Septuagint varies a little from the Hebrew, turning the Imperative Active into a Paſſive Preter (which a ſmall difference of punctation does in the Hebrew) and read thus, *The heart of this people is waxed fat, and they hear heavily with their ears, and their eyes have they cloſed, leſt they ſhould ſee with their eyes, and hear with their ears,*

ears, and underſtand with their heart, and ſhould convert [or, *return*] *and I ſhould heal them.* Which Verſion of the Septuagint S. *Matthew* follows, word for word, *Matth.* xiii. 15. So does S. *Luke*. *Acts* xxviii. 27. Notwithſtanding it is plain, both from Hebrew, from the Septuagint, and from both thoſe Evangeliſts, does S. *John*'s text differ. 1. Whereas the text conſiſts of two Climaxes or gradations, one anſwering the other, S. *John* cuts each ſhort by one ſtep. 2. The Septuagints Verſion, and the Evangeliſts from them, impute all to the people, as their own Act or Choice. *Their heart is grown fat, they hear heavily with their ears, and they have cloſed their eyes.* S. *John* aſcribes all this (following herein the Hebrew) to God and his judgment. 3. The

A.

B.

principal Greek words are in a manner all diverſe. Τετύφλωκε, πεπώρωκε, ἰάσωμαι, ſaith S. *John*. Ὀφθαλμὺς ἐκάμμυσαν· ὠσὶ βαρέως ἤκουσαν· συνῶσι, Septuagint. *Matth. Luk.* Further as to this Text, it is worthy our notice, that it is in three other places of the New Teſtament alledged, at leaſt in part: namely by S. *Luke* in his Goſpel, *Ch.* viii. 10. who there contracts it, and otherwiſe varies from the Septuagint. By *S. Mark Chap.* iv. 12. who in the beginning holds with the Septuagint, but in the cloſe inſtead of, *I ſhould heal them*, puts paraphraſtically, *and their ſins ſhould be forgiven them*, which is one part of healing, leaving herein Hebrew, as well as Septuagint. And laſtly, by *S. Paul, Rom.* xi. 8. who gloſſes on it, differently from all, thus, *God hath given them the Spirit*

Spirit of ſlumber [inſtead of *made their hearts fat*] *eyes that they ſhould not ſee, ears that they ſhould not hear*; with *S. John* and the Hebrew, attributing the Act to God. So that (to note this by the bye, though not to bring it into account) in one and the ſame place ſix times produced in the New Teſtament, there ſeems twice a new Verſion clearly made, *viz.* by *S. John* one, and by *S. Paul* another; Twice is the Old Septuagint followed by *S. Matthew*, and *S. Luke* in the Acts; but alſo twice again varied in a good part, the very ſame Evangeliſt in terms varying from himſelf; All, an ample proof of the Latitude, which is to be acknowledged in theſe Authors ſtiles.

In the xv. of *S. John*, *ver.* 25. there is a tranſient and occaſional

alluſion to an expreſſion *Pſalm* xxxv. 19. And though I might reaſonably ſay, the Evangeliſt here ſeems rather to have followed ſome other Verſion, or reading, than that of the Septuagint (for he produces the text as an intire Propoſition, with a cauſal particle in its beginning, as connecting it with what, in the Original context, is ſuppoſed to have gone before, ὅτι ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν· whereas it is only the ſubject of a Propoſition, or rather of a Petition, both in our Septuagint and Hebrew) though I might, I ſay, take notice of this difference, yet I wave it, and as the *Eighth* Teſtimony produced by *S. John*, reckon that out of *Pſal.* xxii. 29. touching the *ſouldiers dividing* our Lord's *garments amongſt them, and caſting lots upon his*

his ſeamleſs coat, alledged *Chap.* CC.
xix. 24. wherein all agree.

Reckoning as we have done, the Ninth Old Teſtament-text I obſerve, alledged by *S. John* is *Chap.* xix. 36. which whether taken out of *Exod.* xii. 36. or *Num.* ix. 2. varies conſiderably both in phraſe and ſenſe. *Ye ſhall not break a bone from off it*, in the former place: *They ſhall not break a bone from off it*, in the latter: But *S. John* has it, *a bone of him* [or *of* A.
it, viz. of the Paſſeover, a Figure of Chriſt crucified] *ſhall not be broken.* I ought not to wave this difference.

The laſt paſſage I have obſerved *S. John* to produce out of the Old Teſtament, is *Zechariah*, xii. 10. which in the Hebrew ſtands exactly as we have it tranſlated to us, *They ſhall look upon me*

[or, *to me*] *whom they have pierced.* And *S. John* only varying the perſon of the object, re-
A. ports it, *Chap.* xix. 37. *They ſhall look on him whom they have pierced.* But the Septuagint moſt ſtrangely, indeed ſo, as not without difficulty to be reconciled with ſenſe. Ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς [even herein not with *S. John*, Ὄψονται εἰς
† μὲ, ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο. Words of moſt ambiguous meaning, whereas the Original is moſt expreſs and plain: But put what ſenſe we can upon them, nothing can well be more foreign from the Original Prophecy and the Evangeliſts purpoſe, than they are. Some render them, *They ſhall look upon me, for that they have inſulted.* But why Ἀνθ' ὧν, *for that*? If we will retain that ſignification of the Verb, the tranſlation

ſlation would be better, *for thoſe things wherein they have inſulted*, or, *for thoſe perſons, over whom they have inſulted*: Either is more natural than the firſt. However, this text was not produced as a Prophecy of the *Jews* inſulting over, or ſcoffing at, the *Meſſias*, but of their piercing him. And indeed the Authors of this tranſlation ſeem not to have underſtood the text of the *Meſſias* at all. For if we follow, what ſome men tell us is the beſt Edition of the Septuagint, it is not ſaid therein, *they ſhall mourn over him*, but *over themſelves*. Beſides, give me leave to offer an old conjecture of the ground of all this miſinterpretation. The Interpreters read undoubtedly רקדו *They danced* [or *wantonly skipped*, like Rams, as the word is uſed, *Pſalm* CXIV.

cxiv. 4.] for רקרו *They pierced.* How eaſie the miſtake is, any one that knows the Hebrew letters, may ſee. And ſo reading it, they could not have better tranſlated it than as they did, κατωρχήσανλο For though *Hezekias* render κατωρχήσανλο only by κατεχάρησαν [*they rejoiced againſt*] and *Suidas* adds only ἐπαίξαν [*they mocked*] both which together may make up, *They inſulted*; yet is none of theſe the proper, much leſs the only, ſignification of that word. *Budæus*, a perſon of better judgment and accuracy, who alſo brings ever fair Vouchers for what he ſays, proves κατορχεῖσθαι is to *Dance deliciouſly* to the pleaſing and tranſport of the Spectators, or elſe *Mimically and reproachfully.* The former of theſe I take to have

have been designed by the Interpreters, as being the more usual signification of the word. The Jewish Doctors, we must know, have a saying, that in all the Plagues which befel their Nation, since their forefathers guilt in the matter of the Golden Calf, there are still some grains of the Ashes of that Calf in them. Now I verily believe, the Interpreters, in the rendring this text, reflected upon those Idolatrous sports of the old *Jews* (as being leavened with the aforesaid Doctrine) and understood it to be a Prophecy of a deep National humiliation for that National sin in the Wilderness, *Exod.* xxxii. Thus then I judge their Greek text here ought to be rendred, *They shall look upon me for what they Danced*, that is, for their Lewd

Lewd dancing, and voluptuous ſports and ſolemnities before their Idol, when they held that Feaſt, wherein *They ſat down to eat and drink, and roſe up to play.* And thus we have a Prophecy of the *Jews* repentance, for Crucifying the *Meſſiah*, perverted to the occaſion (as I conceive) of the Golden Calf, by the miſreading of the Interpreters. Miſreading, I ſaid; for that they did herein miſinterpret is plain, elſe S. *John* miſinterprets; and I think no better account can be given of their miſinterpreting, than that which I have ſuppoſed, from S. *Hierom*, of their miſreading. But if any will make better ſenſe of their text, I ſhall be glad to hear it. I am ſure if any text, which ſo peculiarly touches the proof of Chriſtianity as this does,

does, had been ſo awkwardly read in the Hebrew, we ſhould have heard largely of Rabbinical corruptions, and malicious frauds of the Modern *Jews*.

But it is time to ſumm up our account here alſo. Of Ten Texts, which are all this Evangeliſt has (as far as I have obſerved) of any tolerable length, whence to judge of a tranſlation; of ten, I ſay, he leaves the Septuagints tranſlation in ſix: and in four of theſe ſix, takes the liberty we have aſſerted, of departing from the ſtrict expreſſions as well of Hebrew as Septuagint. In the other four texts, indeed he follows both Hebrew and Septuagint. But there is not any one inſtance, I have been able to obſerve, in this Evangeliſt, wherein he follows the Septuagint alone,

6 *A*.

4 *B*.

4 *CC*.

alone, that is, receding from the Hebrew Original text. Wherefore I conceive both the Propositions again evidenced by these deductions out of S. *John*.

CHAP. VI.

The Summ of all the Accounts.

TO draw all the Accounts now into one. Of forty Texts out of the Old Teſtament, the Evangeliſts have clearly de-
22 *A.* parted from the Septuagint and tranſlated a-new in twenty two; generally keeping cloſer to the Hebrew than the Septuagint does.

In

In diverſe of theſe Twenty two, as well as in others particularly notified, to the number of Eighteen in all, they have taken the Latitude we aſſerted, varying from the expreſſion of the Hebrew, as well as of the Septuagint, and contenting themſelves to report the general ſenſe of the Teſtimonies they produce. 18 *B.*

Which Summ of Inſtances being found, within ſo ſmall a compaſs, amply proves both the Propoſitions above aſſerted, but not needful here to be repeated.

Further it appears, there are Fourteen texts of the Forty, wherein Hebrew, Septuagint, and Evangeliſts all accord. 14 *CC.*

Again, There are Four in which the Evangeliſts have followed

4C. lowed the Septuagint, ſingly at leaſt, as to ſome expreſſion, or expreſſions, which are not, or ſeem not to be in the Hebrew: which expreſſions that it may appear juſtly of what moment they are, though they are before ſet down a-part, and as they did occurr, yet I will here repeat them together.

Matt. iv. 10. *Him* [*only*] *ſhalt thou ſerve.*

Mark vii. 7. [*Howbeit, in vain do they worſhip me, teaching commandments of men, and Doctrines.* Sept. *Teaching for Doctrines the commandment of men. Mark*] This is only thus far virtually in the Hebrew Text. *Their fear towards me is taught by the precept of men.* [*in vain do they worſhip me*] is an Addition of the Septuagint,

gint, not in the Hebrew, crept in by miſ-reading, though agreeable enough to the ſcope of the text: but followed by S. *Matthew*, as well as *Mark*.

Mark x. 8. *They* [*two*] *ſhall be one fleſh.*

Luke iv. 18. *Recovery of ſight to the blind.* This is virtually in the Hebrew. For פקח which we render *opening*, ſignifies properly the *opening of the eyes*, or *ears*, (as beforeſaid) in which, ſay the Hebrew Criticks, it differs from פתח which ſignifies the *opening of the mouth*: but S. *Luke*, as we have ſeen, to be ſure of expreſſing the full Hebrew ſenſe, both takes the reſtrained tranſlation of the Septuagint, which would emphatically touch ſome of our

Lord's Miracles, and adds a more general one of his own. For we found he there receded from the Septuagints, as well as they from the Hebrew expreſſions. Thus far then, only, in theſe forty Texts, the Evangeliſts have departed from the Hebrew, to hold with the Vulgar Greek Tranſlation then in the hand of the Greciſing *Jews.*

Laſtly, There are five Texts of the number of thoſe, wherein
5 † the Evangeliſts have left the Septuagint clearly, and held with the Hebrew, in which the Septuagint have ſo diſtorted or perverted the ſenſe, that had the Evangeliſts reported them, as the Septuagint rendred them, they would have

have proved Teſtimonies rather againſt the Truth than for it. At leaſt there would have been ſo many Teſtimonies loſt. It would be too tedious here to repeat them.

CHAP. VII.

Obſervations upon the former Account, and the Concluſion.

AND now things ly thus before us, a man would think we might be able to ſee in a manner into the depth of this mighty pretended accord of the Evangeliſts, ſo peculiarly, with

the Septuagint, and what Authority it derives to the Septuagint, or detracts from the Hebrew: In which, that we may proceed with as clear and demonstrative evidence as we can, let me premit, by way of *POSTULATA*, what I think all the world cannot deny.

I. Foraſmuch as it cannot be reputed a meerly caſual and accidental Act in the Evangeliſts, that they thus or thus report any Text out of the Old Teſtament; therefore their receding from, or agreeing with the Septuagint, was with deſign, or an Act of deliberation and choice.

II. Their great deſign in Allegation of Teſtimonies out of the Old Teſtament, being to aſſert and prove Chriſtian Truth, eſpecially to the *Jews*, therefore as it

it was rational when they ſaw any Emphaſis or Advantage more in the Septuagint, than in the Hebrew (becauſe the Septuagint was commonly known, and ſacredly received by the Jews) to uſe it as an *Argumentum ad homines*, to their purpoſe: ſo if at any time we find the Hebrew text to ſerve more to their purpoſe than the Septuagint, and them to have followed the Hebrew text, leaving the Septuagint, we cannot but conclude in ſuch caſe they deſignedly left the Septuagint, as leſs comporting with the Chriſtian Truth, and kept to the Hebrew, as being therein more firm and favourable to Chriſtianity.

Now from hence it muſt follow (which I advance as my

First Propoſition, in order to making a clear eſtimate of the Accord of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles with the Septuagint, and ſo of the Authority as well of the Hebrew text, and the Tranſlations from it, as of the Septuagints Verſion.) From hence, I ſay, it muſt follow, that where the Hebrew text and the Septuagints perfectly agreeing, the Evangeliſts keep to the Septuagint, for as much as it appears by what was laſt premitted, they would not have kept thereto, had the Hebrew made more for their purpoſe; that therefore it is not the Septuagint, abſolutely, which is in ſuch caſe obſerved or kept to, but the Septuagint as agreeing with the Hebrew. That is, the Evangeliſts in thoſe fourteen Texts, wherein they agree both

with

with Hebrew and Septuagint, principally eyed the Hebrew as moſt Authentick, that is, the Hebrew is principally Authentick.

Secondly, I ſay further, whether the Evangeliſts accord with the Septuagint, or tranſlate anew from the Hebrew, they generally confirm the Hebrew text, as Original and Authentick. For of the Forty texts above examined, there are 22. in which the Evangeliſts having left the Septuagint, and either in exact expreſſion, or in general ſenſe, or in both, kept to the Hebrew, have confirmed the Hebrew *againſt* the Septuagint. And there are 14. in which the Septuagint agreeing with the Hebrew, it comes to paſs that the Evangeliſts

agree with both: in which therefore the Evangeliſts have confirmed the Hebrew *with* the Septuagint. That is, in 36. Texts of forty; that is, generally, the Evangeliſts rendring confirms the Hebrew.

Thirdly, I fear not to advance further, and ſay, the Evangeliſts agreement or accord with the Septuagint, yea, even wherein the Septuagint ſeem to go by themſelves, without or from the Hebrew, does not take off the Authority of the Hebrew in thoſe very Texts. For in two of them, *viz. Matth.* iv. 10. and *Mark* x. 8. There are only two new Emphaſes, as I may call them, added to the old Text. And in the other two, namely in *Mark* vii. 7. and *Luke* iv. 18. as, in the former, there

there was one word, *viz.* ותהי, which was easily mis-read ותהו, and so mis-rendred, (yet not so as to alter the main sense or scope of the Text) so in the other, there was a word capable of two senses; Now S. *Luke* gives both, one from the Septuagint, another of his own accord. But as he who makes any argument fuller and clearer, by varying the terms, still keeping to the main sense, or by unfolding all the force which a word of manifold signification bears, or by inserting some new Emphatical term, which shall more press the Adversary, takes not off the Validity of that Argument; so neither doth the Evangelists thus using or manageing Texts of the Old Testament, with all the Emphases, which either by the Septuagints or their own

own rendring them, at all detract from the Original Hebrew, which both only improve. Had the Septuagint contradicted the Hebrew, and the Evangeliſts, in ſuch contradictions, kept with them, the caſe had been otherwiſe. But the main Doctrine and ſenſe being the ſame ſtill, by this following the Septuagint, there is no impeachment at all of the Hebrew.

Fourthly, On the other ſide, I do and muſt affirm, the Septuagints receding from the Original Hebrew does derogate from the authority of the Septuagint. For, (1.) It is plain the Evangeliſts, in the inſtances brought, generally leave the Septuagint, where they leave the Hebrew. Now as the Evangeliſts uſe of the Septuagint,

is the great Mean which conciliates Authority to the Septuagint; ſo their departing from the Septuagints Verſion, to keep with the Hebrew, derogates. (2.) It appears, by the deduction of Particulars, that the preſent Verſion of the Septuagint hath in forty Teſtimonies out of the Old Teſtament perverted five important (and ſome of the moſt conſiderable) Prophecies, relating to the proof, that Jeſus Chriſt is the true Meſſias. A greater derogation from its authority cannot be conceived, except in multiplying inſtances of that kind.

Fifthly, The proof of Chriſtianity more relies upon the Hebrew Text, than on the Septuagints Verſion. For it appears, the Evangeliſts, who deliver the Doctrine

Doctrine thereof unto us, make more uſe of the Hebrew Text; diverſe Prophecies, by the Septuagint diſtorted and mangled, are in the Hebrew intire and direct to our purpoſe; and though we ſhould ſuppoſe, as verily I believe, that the Evangeliſts being to write in Greek, did, to render their writings more unexceptionable to the *Jews*, follow, as much as they could, the *Jews* Greek Tranſlation, that is, the Septuagint; yet we find in ſeveral Prophecies of the greateſt moment, as well as in other points, they could not follow them, and be true to their own Cauſe.

Sixthly, It does not appear by any thing we have examined, that any corruption, or the leaſt eſcape, can be affixt to the Hebrew

brew text. It marvelouſly comports with the Evangeliſts Greek. As to the great objection from *Pſalm* xxii. 16. that we have there כארי *As a Lion*, for כארו *they pierced*, in which, ſay they, the Septuagint has ſet us right: beſides that, even *P. Simon* himſelf, in his late Diſquiſitions, confeſſes כארו is in the very Text, or is the *Ketib* in ſome antient Copies, 'tis enough to me if it were but the *Keri*, or Marginal reading. But I think more cannot be deſired for ſatisfaction, and in ample vindication of the Hebrew, than the great Dr. *Hammond* has given us upon that Pſalm.

Laſtly, In the Septuagints Verſion it is apparent, there muſt be acknowledged groſs Errours. Five places are above marked and aſſigned,

aſſigned, where we muſt ſay, either the Evangeliſts have erred, or the Septuagint: and I have found no one yet ſo hardy as to caſt the Errours on the Evangeliſts, *ergo*, *&c.*

Thoſe, whom what I have ſaid, may a little ſurpriſe, finding things thus notoriouſly otherwiſe than ſome have aſſerted, and haply themſelves too thought, may be ready to ask, what thoſe Aſſerters have to ſay for themſelves in caſe of theſe, and ſuch other Prophecies, thus being perverted rather than tranſlated.

My deſign permits me not to take notice of all: Let it ſuffice to repreſent and animadvert upon their chief anſwers. "It is not "to be denyed, ſay ſome of them, "but that the books of the Sep- "tuagint are in many places [*In-*

"*quinati*

"*quinati & interpolati*] corrupted "and vampt with the Versions "of *Symmachus, Theodotion, &c.* At another time, *Septuaginta Interpretes sic vertisse stultum est existimare.* "'Tis a silly thing to "imagine the Seventy thus rendred. And as to that very Prophecy of *Zech.* xii. "Whether "these Errours came in, out of "*Aquila, &c.* or any other, or by "casual misreading, 'tis needless "to enquire. It is enough to say, "the Septuagint undoubtedly "rendred it otherwise.

These answers, or defences, are perhaps more wonderful than the first assertions. The Septuagint, say they, did not translate thus, 'Tis a silly thing to think they did. But the best Copies of the Septuagint, extant, do contain and exhibit these Translations.

In

In S. *Jerom's* days the Septuagints Version had κατωρχήσαντο, or ὠρχήσαντο. *Hieronym. in loc.* They who at this time of day shall contradict S. *Jerome*, and say, he had only *vitiatum & interpolatum Codicem*, a corrupt and interlined book, when he elsewhere tells us he had *Origen's Hexapla* corrected by himself according to the best Copy; They, who to boot, shall, when they list, that is, when they are not able to defend the Septuagints Version, reject all the Copies of that Version which passes every where for the Septuagints, and say, 'tis a silly thing to believe in this or that, it is the Septuagints, when in another breath, they shall cry up the very worst Copy of the Septuagint, far above all other Translations, and even the Original it self,

ſelf, are indeed perſons to be admired, but I will not ſay, for what. Only I will deſire them, if they expect to be believed, to bring better Proofs than they have done, that is, than their own Word and Scorn.

But to wave what I might ſay more largely of this nature, I only reply, I accept the Anſwer. Behold then, good Reader, how excellently we are helpt up by thoſe, who reject the Hebrew text, and all Tranſlations from it. What, will they reject all Scripture? ſome of them would be at that, if they durſt; but they'l tell you, By no means. What then will they ſet up inſtead of the Hebrew? The Septuagints Verſion. Who now would not expect, that this were moſt perfect, ſubject to no various read-

ings, much leſs corruptions or interpolations. No ſuch matter; beſides infinite various readings, theſe books are corrupted in many places, interpolate with the Verſions of *Symmachus*, *Theodotion*, *Aquila*, and God knows what others. This is their own confeſſion. Again, they are Books, which they will deny at their own pleaſure. Laſtly, Books, which if we will believe the Holy Evangeliſts, have in them many groſs Errours, inconſiſtent with the very Hiſtory, as well as Doctrine, of the Goſpel, and which, as has been proved, the Evangeliſts could not have followed, and together have been faithful to their Cauſe.

To conclude all: We have ſeen the Aſſertion of a *perpetual*, or even *general Agreement* of the *Pen-*

Pen-men of the New Teſtament with the Septuagint to be groundleſs and falſe: boldly advanced by ſome, and too credulouſly taken up by others. (S. *Paul* perhaps, a Perſon more converſant with the *Helleniſts*, moſtly uſed the Septuagint, though not conſtantly: others much leſs.) Contrarily to the aforementioned Aſſertion, The *preſent Hebrew text is confirmed by the Evangeliſts Verſions and agreement with it*; it is *not impeached by their very receſſions* or ſiding with the Septuagint: it ſtands therefore above blemiſh. The *Text of the Septuagint*, beſides its diſorders, confuſions and mutilations (which we might have ſaid much more of) *departs many times groſly from the truth*: It is indeed the Antienteſt and moſt honourable Verſion; it

gives excellent light and confirmation in moſt things to the truth, but it is many times, as ſaid, unhappy. Perhaps it has been purer than it is; yet above theſe thirteen hundred years, it is ſure, it has had ſome of thoſe groſs Errours in it, which we find at this day remaining; and we cannot always hold to it, and together hold to the Goſpel. The proof of Chriſtianity chiefly, and in ſome points (as to Teſtimony) ſolely relies on the Hebrew Text; In which, by all thoſe paſſages, which have been examined, it does not appear that there is any defect, errour, or ſo much as rational pretence of any depravation.

Upon the whole then it remains, That we *adore and magnifie the Providence of our good God*, in *reſtoring*

reſtoring to loſt mankind in general, *the knowledge of God and themſelves*, when they had extinguiſht that given by natural Reaſon, in *preſerving* to us in particular, the *Original Oracles of Salvation* ſo intire as we ſee they are, in *raiſing up to us Perſons* ſo exquiſitely *skilled and verſt in them*, as of old, ſo eſpecially within theſe two laſt Centuries, by whoſe indefatigable labours we have many admirable *Tranſlations* of thoſe Oracles into the *common ſpeech of each Nation*; to none of which Tranſlations, bleſſed be the ſame good God, is our laſt *Engliſh* one inferiour: That therefore we *keep cloſe to theſe*, and ſtand *unſhaken in our Faith*, not ſuffering our ſelves to be impoſed upon by the Cavils, and ſubtle Sophiſms of ſome, or the ſpecious pre-

pretences, of more Neceſſaries than we find in Scripture, from others; nor laſtly, by a third ſorts pompous oſtentation of Learning. Truly, theſe laſt ſeem to have written, only to ſhew the World, how plauſibly they can maintain the moſt miſchievous Paradoxes.

I had many more things to have ſaid: eſpecially, as to that objection of the loſs of the true old Hebrew ſpeech. I could ſhew, the ſame pretences of reaſon may be brought for the loſs of the old Greek, nay, even of the old Latin it ſelf. In all *dead Tongues* the true antient Pronunciation, in proceſs of time, muſt needs be loſt; often alſo the firſt, and true ſignification of many words, whence words muſt neceſſarily grow equivocal or ambiguous, *&c.*

Now

Now it would be thought very extravagant to ſay upon theſe reaſons, the old Greek and Latin are both loſt. We dote if we ſay we have either. Let the ſame Plea be admitted for the old Hebrew. Theſe and other things I thought once to have diſcours'd of in this *Appendix*. But it is much ſwoln already, and I conceive I have ſaid enough to ſettle ſuch, who may be ſhaken, but are deſirous of ſatisfaction: And as to Scepticks, or men of an Inveterate Faction, I have not ſuch thoughts of my ſelf, as that I am able to recover them.

Poſt-

POSTSCRIPT.

THESE notes ought to have been written in a Language more befitting Criticisms of this nature. But the reason they speak plain *English*, is because they are opposed, for the main, to Books, which are made to speak *English*. More Texts also should have been examined, and the search of these carried further. Both may be done in time, if God give leisure, and it appear this Essay does any good. In the mean while, the Candid Reader will take notice, I deal with the People, whom I thought, next to Truth and Plainness, which I have sacredly observed, I could gratifie in nothing more than brevity. God bless all to the end designed.

FINIS.